THE NIGHAṆṬU

AND

THE NIRUKTA

THE OLDEST INDIAN TREATISE

ON ETYMOLOGY, PHILOLOGY, AND SEMANTICS

CRITICALLY EDITED FROM ORIGINAL MANUSCRIPTS AND
TRANSLATED FOR THE FIRST TIME INTO ENGLISH, WITH
INTRODUCTION, EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL NOTES,
THREE INDEXES AND EIGHT APPENDICES

BY

LAKSHMAN SARUP, M. A. (PANJ.) D. PHIL. (OXON.)

INTRODUCTION

HUMPHREY MILFORD
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
LONDON EDINBURGH GLASGOW NEW YORK
TORONTO MELBOURNE CAPE TOWN BOMBAY
1920

PREFACE

When I first came to Oxford in the autumn of 1916, I undertook, on the suggestion of Professor A. A. Macdonell, to collate the hitherto unutilized *Nirukta* Manuscripts, contained in the Max Müller Memorial and the Chandra Shum Shere Collections, and to see if some new light could be thrown on the text of the *Nirukta*. A careful examination of the materials at my disposal has led me to the conclusion that the text of the *Nirukta* has been gradually expanded by the addition of short passages, chiefly in the etymological explanations which easily lent themselves to such interpolations. At present the history of this gradual expansion can be traced only down to the thirteenth century A.D. There is a lack of reliable evidence going further. But I have reasons to suspect that even up to the thirteenth century, the text of the *Nirukta* has not been handed down with a uniform and unbroken tradition. A few remarks of Durga scattered here and there in his commentary open up the possibility that the interpolators were already busy with their nefarious work. There is no doubt that the text had already been tampered with. Thus one should be cautious in making Yāska responsible for many passages, and the numerous absurd derivations contained therein, now commonly attributed to him. All such passages have been pointed out in my edition of the text, which sets forth as clearly as possible the history of the gradual expansion by means of square brackets and foot-notes.

I have also produced, for the first time, a complete English translation of the whole of the *Nirukta*. I have added numerous exegetical and critical notes with a view to extract as much information as possible from Yāska. And in order to make my work further useful, I have also prepared the following Indexes and Appendices: (1) An Index to the words of the *Nighaṇṭu* with meanings; (2) An Index to the words of the Quoted Passages occurring in the *Nirukta* with meanings; (3) an Index

Verborum to the *Nirukta* minus the Quoted Passages with meanings; (4) An alphabetical list of the Quotations occurring in the *Nirukta*; (5) An alphabetical list of the Untraced Quotations occurring in the *Nirukta*; (6) A list of Vedic Quotations arranged in the order of the *Saṁhitās*; (7) A list of the Authorities mentioned by Yāska; (8) A list of Stories related by Yāska; (9) The Relation of the *Nirukta* to other texts, i.e. a collection of parallel passages from the *Brāhmaṇas, Prātiśākhyas, Mahābhāṣya,* &c.; (10) An alphabetical list of the etymologies to be found in the *Nirukta*; (11) A list of the *Nirukta* passages quoted by Sāyaṇa. The whole work being embodied in the form of a dissertation was presented to, and accepted by, the University of Oxford, for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. Notwithstanding the Statt. Tit. VI, Sec. v, § 5. (8), which requires an Advanced Student to publish his thesis *in extenso* before supplicating for the said degree, the Committee for Advanced Studies very kindly permitted me—taking into consideration the very high cost of printing at present—to publish the Introduction alone. I think I need make no apology for bringing out this part only at present, in the hope that the rest will follow in course of time.

If my labours have borne any fruit, it is simply due to the guidance which I have received in the course of my work, and which it is my very pleasant duty to acknowledge.

I owe a great debt of gratitude to Professor A. A. Macdonell. The inception of this study is, as I have already mentioned, due to his suggestion. The whole work was done under his supervision. His guidance and encouragement have been of invaluable help to me. And through his recommendation the Administrators to the Max Müller Memorial Fund have voted a sum of £50 for the publication of my dissertation—my thanks to them for this generous help. I am much indebted to Dr. F. W. Thomas, Librarian, India Office, and to Dr. J. Morison, Librarian, Indian Institute, Oxford, for granting me facilities in the use of books, and for their readiness to help me in every way whenever I had the occasion to seek their advice. I desire to put on record my special thanks to Mr. Madan, ex-Librarian of the Bodleian, for permission to work on valuable manuscripts during the dark days of air-raids, when the manuscripts had been carefully stored away. Professor A. B. Keith has placed me under great

obligation by giving me his valuable opinion on many difficult points. Dr. T. W. Arnold, C.I.E., Educational Adviser to the Secretary of State for India, has taken a good deal of interest in my work and has supported me in almost every obstacle to the completion of my studies.

It has been my privilege to interpret an ancient Indian author, who, as far as Etymology and Semantics are concerned, is far in advance of the greatest of ancient Greek writers like Plato and Aristotle, and if he comes to be better appreciated, my labour will be amply repaid.

LAKSHMAN SARUP.

BALLIOL COLLEGE, OXFORD.
July, 1920.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

THE NIGHAṆṬU

THE following manuscripts have been collated for this edition of the *Nighaṇṭu*:

1.	Max Müller Memorial MS.	e. 5 = M 1
2.	„ „ „ „	e. 6 = M 2
3 and 4.	„ „ „ „	e. 7 = M 3 and M 4 respectively
5.	Chandra Shum Shere MS.	d. 184 = C 1
6, 7, 8.	„ „ „ „	e. 62 = C 2, C 3, C 4 respectively
9.	MS. Sanskrit	e. 17 = S
10.	MS. Wilson	379 = W 1
11 and 12.	„ „	502 = W 2, W 3 respectively
13.	„ „	503 = W 4

a. Detailed Description of the Manuscripts.

M 1.—This is a neatly-written manuscript in *Devanāgarī* characters on paper. It originally consisted of 13 leaves, but the first two are missing. The accent has been marked in yellow ink. The text is not bounded on either side by double lines.

The size of the paper is $9\frac{1}{8}'' \times 3\frac{3}{4}''$.

The number of lines on each page varies from 9 to 10. The date given on f. 14 r. as *Śak.* 1455, is not reliable, and has obviously been added at a later period by a different hand, as the evidence of the writing indicates. The manuscript is well preserved, but neither its general appearance nor the condition and the colour of its paper, nor its spelling lend the least support to the date given above. It is on the whole accurate. It belongs to the longer recension. The scribe seems to have been a devotee of Kṛṣṇa, for he says: श्री कृष्णार्पणमस्तु. Neither the name of the scribe, nor of the owner, nor of the place of its origin, is known.

M 2.—This is perhaps the oldest of all the manuscripts of the *Nighaṇṭu*. It is written in *Devanāgarī* characters on paper, but is not well preserved. In many places it suffers from illegibility, partly caused by the smudging of the ink.

It begins: ॐ नमो गणेशाय ॥ ॐ ॥ अथ शिक्षां प्रवक्ष्यामि . . ., &c. It gives the *Śikṣā Catuṣṭaya* in 26 leaves. The different treatises are not bodily

separated from each other, all the four, i.e. *Śikṣā*, *Jyotiṣa*, *Chandas* and *Nighaṇṭu* being written continuously without a break. The end of each is found on f. 4 r., f. 7 v., f. 12 r., and f. 24 v. respectively. The accent is not marked. The text is bounded on each side by double black lines.

The size of the paper is $9\frac{4}{5}'' \times 4\frac{4}{5}''$.

The number of lines on each page varies from 10–13.

It has preserved the archaic spelling in many cases, especially in the case of च्री ; चौरचाक: is written त्वोरचाक: and तौरचाक: as त्तोरचाक: on f. 22 v. Ff. 15–26 are slightly worm-eaten. It was copied in the month of *Phālguna*, *Saṃvat* 1778, by a scribe named Śivānanda. It belongs to the shorter recension.

M 3.—This is a paper manuscript, neatly written in *Devanāgarī* characters. In this manuscript also the *Śikṣā*, *Jyotiṣa*, *Chandas*, and *Nighaṇṭu* are written without a break between them. The accent in the *Nighaṇṭu* is not marked. The size of the paper is $9'' \times 4''$, and the number of lines on each page is 7. The text is bounded on each side by double red lines. The name of the owner is Āśārāma Kedāreśvara, son of Śrī Nandarāma. It was copied for private study at Benares. The date given is *Saṃvat* 1801: (*sic*) संवत् १८०१ नामिति श्रावणमासे शुक्लपक्षे पंचमीयं बुधवासरे ग्रंथसमाप्तिः ॥ शुभमस्तु ॥ The manuscript ends: (*sic*) सर्वेषां खण्डिकासंख्या ॥ १०० ॥ श्लोकसंख्या ॥ ३७५ ॥

तैलाद्रक्षेज्जलाद्रक्षेद्रक्षेच्छिथिलबन्धनात् ।
मूर्खहस्ते न दातव्यं एवं वदति पुस्तकम् ॥
शुभं भवतु ॥ कल्याणमस्तु ॥

It belongs to the shorter recension.

M 4.—This contains the *Śikṣā*, &c., without a break between them, and gives, in 23 leaves, the *Śikṣā*, *Jyotiṣa*, *Chandas*, and *Nighaṇṭu*, which end on f. 5 v., f. 8 r., f. 13 r., and f. 23 v. respectively. The five *adhāyās* of the *Nighaṇṭu* end on f. 15 v., f. 18 v., f. 21 r., f. 22 v., f. 23 v. respectively. It begins: श्री गणेशाय नमः ॥ श्री दुर्गादेव्यै नमः ॥ ॐ अथ शिक्षां प्रवक्ष्यामि, &c. It ends: इति नैघंटुके पंचमोध्यायः समाप्तः ॥

The size of paper is $8\frac{2}{5}'' \times 3\frac{2}{5}''$; the number of lines on each page is 8. The text is bounded on either side by double red lines. The accent is marked in the *Nighaṇṭu* with red ink. No date is given, nor the name of the scribe, nor the place.

It belongs to the longer recension.

C 1.—It consists of three different manuscripts. The first manuscript, which gives the *Nighaṇṭu* in full, seems to be a fragment, for the first folio is numbered 10. It appears that originally it gave the *Śikṣā Catuṣṭaya*,

and that now the *Nighaṇṭu* alone survives. It begins on f. 10 r., and ends on f. 22 r. The text is bounded on each side by double red lines. The accent is marked. The size of the paper is 9″ × 4⅛″; the number of lines is 11. It ends: (*sic*) इति निघंटौ पंचमोध्यायः ॥ श्री तीक्ष्मांडेश्वरार्पणमस्तु ॥ श्री गंगा प्रसन् ॥

The date *Śak.* 1875, and the name of the then owner, Gopāla Ānanda Sarasvatī, are added in a different, probably later, hand. It belongs to the longer recension.

C 2.—Is the first of five different manuscripts bound in one volume [e. 62]. It contains the *Nighaṇṭu* in 17 leaves, marking the accent with red ink in the first *adhyāya* only.

It begins: ॥ श्री गणेशाय नमः ॥ हरिः ॐ ॥ It ends: (*sic*) इति निघंटे पंचमोध्यायः ॥ समाप्तः ॥ Neither the date nor the name of the scribe is given.

The size of the paper is 8⅕″ × 3½″. The number of lines on each page is 7. Ff. 15, 16, 17 are slightly worm-eaten.

It is written in *Devanāgarī* characters on paper, and is fairly accurate. It belongs to the longer recension.

C 3–C 4.—Are contained in the same volume, each being a *Śikṣā Catuṣṭaya*, of which the *Nighaṇṭu* forms a part. The text of each of these *Śikṣā Catuṣṭaya* is written continuously, and is bounded by double red lines. The size of the paper is 8⅕″ × 4, and the number of lines on each page is 10. The first two sections of the first *adhyāya* are missing in the first manuscript. The other manuscript is dated *Saṃvat*, 1852.

Both are written in *Devanāgarī* characters and represent the longer recension.

The other manuscripts are a *Śikṣā* attributed to Pāṇini, and a *Śikṣā* attributed to Yājñavalkya. The latter begins: (*sic*) ॐ श्री गणेशाय नमः याज्ञवल्क्य उवाच अथातस्त्रैस्वर्यलक्षणं व्याख्यास्यामः उदात्तस्यानुदात्तस्य स्वरितस्य तथैव तत् लक्षणं वर्णयिष्यामि दैवतं स्थानमेव च, &c. It ends: इति श्री याज्ञवल्क्यमुनिकृता वाजसनेयीशिक्षा समाप्ता संवत्? ३० माघमासे . . . . समाप्ता रामः विश्र विश्र विश्र वि.

Another manuscript bound in the same volume gives in seven leaves the *Śikṣā* of the *Sāma Veda*, attributed to Lomaśa. It begins: ॐ नमः सामवेदाय. It has preserved some old spellings; for instance, it writes वेद as ावद.

The last manuscript gives the *Chandomañjarī* in 5 leaves. It begins: (*sic*) श्री गणपतये नमः ॥ प्रणम्य वेदं पुरुषं छन्दःशास्त्रेषु निश्चितं । विष्णुभट्टेस्त्विदं प्रीतं

छंदोमंजरिमादिता ॥१॥ छंदोमंजरी कथ्यते ॥ प्रथमं छन्दः ॥ गायत्री ॥ उदाहरणानि॰ अग्निमीळे ८।८।८ पद्पंक्ति, &c.

It ends: इति श्री विष्णुभट्टविरचिता छंदोमंजरी समाप्ता।

S 4.—This manuscript contains five works. The first four consist of the *Śikṣā Catuṣṭaya*, of which the first three works are probably written by the same scribe. The first part gives the *Śikṣā* in 6 leaves, the second the *Jyotiṣa* in 4, the third the *Chandas* in 7 leaves, the fourth the *Nighaṇṭu*.[1] The first and third were copied in *Śaka* 1665, and the fourth in *Śaka* 1660. All these four parts are complete in themselves individually, each being separately numbered. The name of their former owner is Bhaṭṭa Jayanārāyaṇa of Themṭi.

The *Nighaṇṭu* consists of 9 leaves. The text is bounded on each side by a pair of double red lines. It is a neatly-written manuscript, The accent is marked with red ink. The size of the paper is $9\frac{1}{2}'' \times 3\frac{3}{4}''$. For further details see *Catalogus Codd. MSS. Bib. Bodl.*, by Winternitz and Keith, vol. ii, p. 105.

The manuscript belongs to the longer recension, and does not seem to have been used by Roth.

W 1.—This contains two different manuscripts. The first is *Vedārthadīpikā*, a commentary on the *Sarvānukramaṇī* by Ṣaḍguruśiṣya.

The second is the *Nighaṇṭu*. It begins on f. 1 v., and ends on f. 10 r. It is without accent, quite modern, and full of mistakes. It is Roth's F. It belongs to the shorter recension.

For further details, see *Catalogus Codd. MSS, Bib. Bodl.*, by Winternitz and Keith, vol. ii, p. 104.

W 2.—This manuscript contains three different works.

I. The first work is the *Śikṣā Catuṣṭaya*. It is a continuously-written manuscript, the four parts ending on f. 3 v., f. 6 v., f. 11 v., and f. 23 respectively. The *Nighaṇṭu* is given without accent. It is Roth's C, and belongs to the shorter recension. For further details see *Catalogus Codd. MSS. Bib. Bodl.*, vol. ii, p. 104.

W 3. II. This is the second manuscript bound in the volume just mentioned. It gives the *Nighaṇṭu* in 24 leaves. It is without accent. The name of the scribe, partially obliterated by yellow pigment, is the following: भट्टनारायणसुतविश्रामेण लिखितं ॥ रामेश्वरपठनार्थम् ॥ परोपकारार्थम् ॥

It is Roth's D, and belongs to the shorter recension.

III. The third manuscript is the *Anuvākānukramaṇī*.

W 4.—This manuscript contains two different works. The first is the *Śikṣā Catuṣṭaya*. Its first three parts are written continuously. The

[1] The fifth is the *Uttaraṣaṭkam* of the *Nirukta*.

Nighaṇṭu is separated from the rest. It ends on f. 16, which gives a list of the total number of words and *Khaṇḍas* for each *adhyāya* as follows:—

	Khaṇḍa	words			
1st	17	412	4th	8	279
2nd	22	516	5th	6	151
3rd	30	410			

It is Roth's E, and belongs to the longer recension.

To these manuscripts, which I have directly collated myself, may be added the A and B which were used by Roth (not directly collated by me), besides C.D.E.F = W 1, W 2, W 3, W 4, and क, ख, ग, घ, ङ, and च used by Sāmaśrami, in his edition, published in the Bib. Ind.

b. Two recensions.

The manuscripts fall into two distinct groups: M 2, M 3, W 1, W 2, W 3 and ग form one family group, and M 1, M 4, C 1, C 2, C 3, C 4, S, W 4; A, B, E; क, ख, घ, ङ, and च the other. The former may be called the shorter recension, the latter the longer. The chief reason for calling the former group the shorter recension is that at the end of every section the explanation is more concise than in the other. The latter not only gives an extended explanation at the end of every section, but also adds the number of the words enumerated in the section. Besides, at the end of every chapter, it gives a summary of the sections by quoting the first word of every section, and adds the number of the sections in the chapter. In many sections the shorter recension gives fewer words. It is difficult to decide which of these two represents the original. But as far as the longer explanation at the end of every section is concerned, it is quite obvious that it is a later addition. The evidence of the manuscripts shows that this addition was gradual. For instance, let us take the first section of the first chapter. All the manuscripts of the shorter recension agree in giving the text as follows: गौरिति पृथिव्याः. Manuscript W 2 gives the number of the section only, i.e. ॥ १ ॥, and throughout it follows this method, which seems to have been the original one. Gradually a change was introduced: along with the number of the section, the number of the words in the section was added, and a numerical figure placed immediately before the number of the section, as the evidence of manuscripts M 2 and W 3 indicates, in the first section of the first chapter, ॥ २१ ॥ is placed before ॥ १ ॥ i.e. गौरिति पृथिव्याः ॥ २१ ॥ १ ॥ In this connexion it is interesting to note that manuscripts W 1 and M 3 at first agree with W 2, but gradually come round to the side of M 2 and W 3. The next stage of development is marked by the incorporation of the numerical word in substitution for the

figure in the body of the explanation, as ॥ गोचेत्येकविंशतिः पृथिव्याः ॥. This is most clearly seen in the sections containing verbs, for instance, in sec. 16 of the first chapter, all the stages appear very clearly:

a. घुमदिति ज्वलतिकर्माणः ॥ १६ ॥ W 1, W 2.

b. „ „ ॥ ११ ॥ १६ ॥ M 2, M 3, W 3.

c. घुमदित्येकादश ज्वलतिकर्माणः ॥ १६ ॥ Manuscripts of longer recension.

From the verbs the process was extended by analogy to nouns, perhaps in imitation of Yāska's own words or for the sake of parallelism, नामधेयानि was also introduced. Last of all came the summary and the statement of the sections in every chapter.

Yāska's description of the *Nighaṇṭu* । *Samāmnāyaḥ Samāmnātaḥ* । *Sa vyākhyātavyaḥ* । N. I. 1.—and taking into consideration the fact that in some cases, like that of *Nighaṇṭu* II. 6, 8, 11, &c., his only explanation is that a particular word has so many synonyms—suits the shorter recension better, for in the case of the longer recension such an explanation is superfluous. *Nighaṇṭu* II. 11, the shorter recension reads शक्करीति गवां, while the longer has: शक्करीति नव गोनामानि, and Yāska's only explanation (N. 3. 9) is: गोनामान्युत्तराणि नव. To call this the explanation of the longer recension is absurd, while in the case of the shorter recension it may be accepted as an explanation to a certain extent.

c. Devarāja and his commentary.

Devarājayajvan explains every single word of the *Nighaṇṭu*; his commentary therefore is valuable, for it shows the state of the *Nighaṇṭu* in his day. Moreover, in the introduction to his Commentary, he gives a general description of the many manuscripts of the *Nighaṇṭu* known to him. He says: तेषु च केषुचिद्ग्रन्थेषु लेखकप्रमादादिभिः कानिचित्पदान्यधिकान्यासन् । अन्येषु च कानिचिन्न्यूनानि । अपरेषु च कानिचिदपहाय कानिचित् विन्यस्तानि । अपराणि च विपर्यस्तानि । एवं व्याकीर्णेषु कोशेषु नियमैकभूतस्य प्रतिपदनिर्वचननिगमप्रदर्शनपरस्य कस्यचिद् व्याख्यानस्याभावात् नैघण्टुकं काण्डमुत्सन्नप्रायमासीत् ।

He has attempted to supply a critical edition, for he says that Yāska explained 150 words of the *Naighaṇṭuka Kāṇḍa*, and Skandasvāmi, in his commentary on Yāska, added some more, bringing the total to 200, so the evidence of Yāska and Skandasvāmi was very valuable for these 200 words. About the rest he says: अन्येषां च पदानामस्मत् कुले समाम्नायाध्ययनस्याविच्छेदात्-श्रीवेङ्कटाचार्यतनयस्य माधवस्य भाष्यकृतो नामानुक्रमण्या आख्यातानुक्रमण्याः स्वरानुक्रमण्या निपातानुक्रमण्या निर्वचनानुक्रमण्यास्तदीयस्य भाष्यस्य च बहुशः पर्यालोचनात् बहुदेशसमानीतात् बहुकोशनिरीक्षणाच्च पाठः संशोधितः ।

Devarāja has frequently given the readings of former commentators like Skandasvāmi, Bhaṭṭa Bhāskaramiśra, and Mādhava, when he differed from them. His commentary has therefore the value of a collation of a number of manuscripts, brought as he says from various parts of the country, and also of the collation of former commentaries. I have carefully examined it and noted all the differences, as the foot-notes to the text will show.

d. **Roth's edition of the Nighaṇṭu.**

Roth examined the commentary of Devarāja, but the manuscripts which he used were probably defective, so that his results are unsatisfactory. Often he attributes readings to Devarāja which are not to be found in the published text of that commentator; for instance (I. 11) the reading **पा** is attributed to Devarāja, who actually reads **पाः**; he also passes over variants given by Devarāja. Devarāja gives **नगा** as a variant for **नपा**, which Roth does not mention. Similarly Devarāja gives **सुरा** (I. 12) as a different reading, which Roth again does not notice. Devarāja gives **प्रयः** for **पयः**, which Roth ignores. Other cases are:

I. 14. Roth attributes **यह्वः** to Dev., who reads **यव्हः**, and gives **यव्हाः** as a variant.

I. 13. Dev. gives **ऋतावर्यः** for **वर्यः** as the reading of Mādhava, unnoticed by Roth.

I. 18. Dev. gives **रेवत्यः** for **स्रवन्त्यः** as another reading, unnoticed by Roth.

I. 14. Roth attributes **उच्चैःश्रवसः** to Dev., whose actual reading is **औच्चैःश्रवसः**

I. 15. Dev. reads **उषसः** for **उषसां** and gives **उषसः** as the reading of Skandasvāmi, unnoticed by Roth.

I. 16. Dev. gives **भ्लाशयति** as another reading for **भ्राशयति** unnoticed by Roth.

II. 1. Dev. gives **पर्क्षतम्** as the reading of Mādhava for **पक्षत्**, Roth does not notice it.

II. 5. Dev. gives **अपर्यव:** as a different reading for **अपर्यः**, Roth does not notice it.

II. 7. Dev. gives **प्रयः** as the reading of Skandasvāmi also, but he further gives **अयः** as a variant. Roth does not notice it.

II. 7. Dev. gi es **सुतः** as a variant for **पयः**, Roth does not notice it.

It is unnecessary to multiply instances, for all such cases can be easily found in my foot-notes to the text of the *Nighaṇṭu*.

Roth does not give any various readings for the fourth chapter of the *Nighaṇṭu*, although the evidence of the manuscripts as shown in this edition proves that there are several such variants.

There are a few inaccuracies of accent, for instance in III. 13. अ॒पि मे ये is accented in manuscripts, but not so in Roth's edition.

There is, however, a serious omission in IV. 2. हरयाणः has been omitted between अह्रयाणः and आरितः. That the omission is an oversight appears from the fact that though this section is stated to contain 84 words, Roth's edition has only 83. Yāska explains every word of the fourth and fifth chapters of the *Nighaṇṭu*. His evidence is therefore particularly valuable for a critical edition of the fourth and fifth chapters. He gives हरयाणः in its proper place and explains it. Both the recensions agree in reading हरयाणः between अह्रयाणः and आरितः, and the testimony of Devarāja and Yāska supports this reading The omission[1] in Roth's edition is thus evidently due to an oversight.

The evidence of Yāska on the fourth and fifth chapters of the *Nighaṇṭu* indicates that he follows the longer recension. Thus in IV. 1 the shorter recension gives इषिरः, but Yāska reads इषिरेण, which is also the reading of the longer recension. Again जू च, which is omitted by the shorter recension, is explained by Yāska. In IV. 2 दूतः is omitted by the shorter recension, but not by Yāska. Devarāja has also followed the longer recension, and this choice seems to be followed by a long line of commentators, and is also, as Devarāja says, supported by an unbroken tradition in his own family. The shorter recension has undoubtedly preserved the original form of the text, at least towards the end of the sections, but the weighty testimony of Yāska is against it. I have therefore given the text and the order in which the words occur in accordance with the longer recension, though at the end of every section I have placed side by side the text of both recensions.

e. Bib. Ind. edition of the Nighaṇṭu.

Sāmaśrami's edition of the *Nighaṇṭu* is useful, for besides publishing the commentary of Devarāja Yajvan it supplies a much larger number of various readings than Roth. But it suffers from the one defect of presenting only Devarāja's reading of the text of the *Nighaṇṭu*. The commentary of Devarāja, however valuable as giving the various readings of the manuscripts of his time, cannot be made the sole basis of an edition of the *Nighaṇṭu*. Moreover, occasionally the text in this edition contains words which are not justified either by the evidence of the manuscripts of

[1] This was admitted, and later on rectified by Roth himself.

both recensions, or even by that of Devarāja himself. For instance, on p. 236, appears the word **संसति**, which does not exist anywhere; again, on p. 257, we find **साचिवित्** instead of the correct form **साचीवित्**. Sāmaśrami seems to have used six manuscripts, from which he gives a number of various readings in foot-notes, but in the constitution of the text he has consistently followed Devarāja. Hence it is not a critical edition, from the point of view of constituting an independent text of the *Nighaṇṭu* based on manuscript evidence.

f. The title of the work.

Sāyaṇācārya in the *Ṛgvedabhāṣyabhūmikā* has given the title of *Niruktam* to this list of words. He says: **अर्थावबोधे निरपेक्षतया पदजातं यत्रोक्तं तन्निरुक्तम्। गौः। ग्मा। ज्मा। क्ष्मा। क्षा। क्षमा इत्यारभ्य वसवः। वाजिनः। देवपत्न्यो देवपत्न्य इत्यन्तो यः पदानां समाम्नायः समाम्नातस्तस्मिन् ग्रन्थे पदार्थावबोधाय परापेक्षा न विद्यते.....। तदेतन्निरुक्तं त्रिकाण्डम्....पञ्चाध्यायरूपे काण्डत्रयात्मक एतस्मिन् ग्रन्थे परनिरपेक्षितया पदार्थस्योक्तत्वात् तस्य ग्रन्थस्य निरुक्तत्वमिति।**

Madhusūdanasvāmi, the author of the *Prasthānabheda* has also given the title of *Niruktam* to this list of words. Similarly Sāmaśrami follows Sāyaṇa in calling the work *Niruktam*, although he adds in brackets (*Nighaṇṭu*). Sāyaṇa is evidently wrong in giving the title of *Niruktam* to the *Samāmnāya*, for Yāska distinctly states that it is called *Nighaṇṭu*. *Samāmnāyaḥ samāmnātaḥ . . . . tam imam Samāmnāyaṃ Nighaṇṭava ityācakṣate* । (N. I. 1). The list of words can only be called *Nighaṇṭu*, and it is wrong to call it *Niruktam*; the term *Nirukta* can be applied only when some etymological explanations are given. Moreover, all the manuscripts call it *Nighaṇṭu*.

g. The division of the Nighaṇṭu.

The *Nighaṇṭu* contains five chapters, the first three are called the *Naighaṇṭuka Kāṇḍa*, the fourth the *Naigama Kāṇḍa*, and the fifth the *Daivata Kāṇḍa*. In other words it may be said that

the *Naighaṇṭuka Kāṇḍa* deals with synonyms;
the *Naigama Kāṇḍa* deals with homonyms;
the *Daivata Kāṇḍa* deals with deities.

There is some sort of a principle discernible in the arrangement of the synonyms in the first three chapters. The first chapter deals with physical things like earth, air, water, and objects of nature like cloud, dawn, day and night, &c. The second chapter deals with man, his limbs, like arm, finger, objects and qualities associated with man, such as wealth, prosperity, anger, battle, &c.

The third chapter deals with abstract qualities such as heaviness, lightness, &c. The arrangement, of course, is not scientific, nor, in many cases, even systematic, but it shows at least an attempt to group the words methodically. The compilation of the *Nighaṇṭu* is the earliest known attempt in lexicography. In India it marks the beginning of the *Kośa* literature, and later *Kośās* have sometimes been called *Nighaṇṭavas*. The *Nighaṇṭu* contains only a small number of the words of the *Ṛgveda*, and as it does not contain any explanations of the words collected, in Sanskrit or any other language, the modern term 'dictionary' cannot be applied to it, although the *Kośās* can be so called. It should rather be called a vocabulary, which is a book 'containing a collection of words of a language, dialect, or subject'—when 'the words are few in number, being only a small part of those belonging to the subject, or when they are given without explanation, or some only are explained, or explanations are partial'.

h. The author of the Nighaṇṭu.

Nothing definite is known of the author of the *Nighaṇṭu*. There is a vague reference to the time of its compilation in the *Nirukta* I. 20, which attributes the compilation of the *Nighaṇṭu* along with other *Vedāñgas* to a later generation of the sages who had no direct perception of *dharma* (truth).

The following two verses occur in the *Mokṣa parvan* of the *Mahābhārata*, chapter 342. 86, 87:

वृषो हि भगवान् धर्मः ख्यातो लोकेषु भारत ।
निघण्टुकपदाख्याने विद्धि मां वृषमुत्तमम् ॥
कपिर्वराहः श्रेष्ठश्च धर्मश्च वृष उच्यते ।
तस्माद् वृषाकपिं प्राह कश्यपो मां प्रजापतिः ॥

Some conclude from the second verse that Kaśyapa,[1] the Prajāpati, is the author of the *Nighaṇṭu*, for the word *vṛṣākapi* occurs in the *Nighaṇṭu*. It is not safe to build any argument upon such evidence, for supposing that Kaśyapa did invent the word *vṛṣākapi* he would be the last person to put his own word in a list of difficult words like those of the *Nighaṇṭu*. The *Nighaṇṭu* is probably not the production of a single individual, but the result of the united efforts of a whole generation, or perhaps of several generations.

[1] The theory of Kaśyapa's authorship is indeed absurd, and hardly deserves any mention, but as many people in India believe in it, and seriously put it forward, I thought it necessary to make a passing reference to it.

THE NIRUKTA

a. Earlier editions of the Nirukta.

The *editio princeps* of the *Nirukta* was brought out by Rudolph Roth, and published at Göttingen in 1852. Sanskrit scholarship in Europe was then in its infancy. The bulk of the Vedic literature was as yet accessible in manuscripts only. Even the text of the *Ṛgveda* in print was not available, Max Müller having given to the world the first two volumes only of his edition of the *Ṛgveda* with Sāyaṇa's commentary.[1] Guides to Vedic studies which are now indispensable, such as Prof. Macdonell's *Vedic Grammar,* and books of reference like Bloomfield's *Vedic Concordance*, did not exist at that time. There was not even a good *Vedic* dictionary. Taking these facts into consideration, Roth's achievement was remarkable. He was the first to observe that the text of the *Nirukta* has been handed down in two recensions, a shorter and a longer one, and to prepare a critical edition of the same based on the manuscript material to which he then had access. It must be admitted that as far as the text of the *Nirukta* is concerned Roth's work has not been superseded so far, and this fact alone is very creditable to the author of a work published nearly 70 years ago, and speaks highly of the critical judgement exercised by him in the constitution of the text.

But it is obvious that a work produced under such circumstances and about three-quarters of a century ago shows certain defects and limitations. First of all, the materials at his disposal were scanty. For instance, he seems to have consulted only one manuscript of Durga's commentary, i.e. MS. Mill 142,[2] by no means an accurate manuscript, and Roth's incorrect quotations from Durga's commentary, which I have pointed out in my notes, are perhaps due to the errors of this manuscript. Hence he could not have found it a very reliable guide. Secondly, many of the then prevailing methods of indicating references are now obsolete, as, for instance, Roth's division of the *Ṛgveda* into *Maṇḍala, anuvāka*, &c., which has curtailed, to some extent, the usefulness of his *Nachweisung*, pp. 217–28. He gives a list of various readings at the end of the first and the second part of the *Nirukta*, but does not specify that such and such a variant is to be found in such and such a manuscript, a very unsatisfactory method of procedure, which no modern editor would follow. Further, Roth has adopted the text of the longer recension in his edition, but he does not

[1] Professor J. Wackernagel has been kind enough to write to me from Bâle that as Roth's *Nirukta* first began to be printed in 1847, he could not therefore have made use of Max Müller's edition of the *Ṛgveda*, the preface to the first volume of which is dated Oct. 1849.

[2] Described by Keith in the *Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library*, vol. ii, p. 108.

show any reason for this preference. As proved by me elsewhere, the longer recension does not represent the original text of the *Nirukta.* Again, he divided the *pariśiṣṭa* into two chapters, the 13th and the 14th, a division not supported by the evidence of older manuscripts, which makes the whole of the *pariśiṣṭa* to consist of one chapter (the 13th) only. Roth is also wrong in using the term *Naigama Kāṇḍam* as applicable to the first three chapters of the *Nirukta,* the right term being *Naighaṇṭuka Kāṇḍam.* Further, there are some inaccuracies in the text of the *Nirukta* itself, which I have pointed out in my notes. Again, there is the inexplicable inconsistency in using large type for printing some Vedic quotations, and small type for others, even when they are of the same length, and are cited from the same Veda. For instance, the passage आपित्वे नः प्रपित्वे तूयमा गहि [1] is printed in large type and is accented, whilst the immediately following passage अभीके चिदु लोककृत् [2] is printed in small type, and is not accented, although both quotations are from the *Ṛgveda.* Other examples are: उपोप मे परा मृश मा मे दभ्राणि मन्यथाः [3] is in large type and accented, but नमो महद्भ्यो नमो अर्भकेभ्यः [4] is in small type [5] and unaccented. Again, तिरश्चिदर्यया परि वर्तिः . . . . [6] is in large type and accented; while पात्रेव भिन्दन्सत एति . . . . [7] is in small type and unaccented; and अमी य ऋक्षा निहितास उच्चा [8] is in large type and accented; while पश्यन्तो द्यामिव स्तृभिः [9] is in small type and unaccented. Again, यस्यामुशन्तः प्रहराम शेपम् [10] is in large type [11] and accented; while त्रिः स्म माह्नः श्नथयो वैतसेन [12] is in small type and unaccented. And यस्य शुष्माद्रोदसी अभ्यसेताम् [13] is in large type and accented; while रेजते अग्ने पृथिवी मखेभ्यः [14] is in small type and unaccented.

In one case, Roth treats both quotations in the same manner: वम्रीभिः पुत्रमग्रुवो अदानम् [15] is in large type [16] and accented. यदत्त्युपजिह्विका यद्वम्रो अति सर्पति [17] is also in large type and accented.

[1] RV. viii. 4. 8; N. iii. 20, Roth's ed., p. 62.
[2] RV. x. 133. 1.
[3] RV. i. 126. 7.
[4] RV. i. 27. 13.
[5] Roth's ed., p. 63.
[6] RV. v. 75. 7.
[7] RV. vii. 104. 21.
[8] RV. i. 24. 10.
[9] RV. iv. 7. 3.
[10] RV. x. 85. 37.
[11] Roth's ed., p. 64.
[12] RV. x. 95. 5.
[13] RV. ii. 12. 1.
[14] RV. vi. 66. 9.
[15] RV. iv. 19. 9.
[16] Roth's ed., p. 63.
[17] RV. viii. 102. 21.

This practice of Roth is misleading, and is perhaps responsible for the fact that several Vedic passages printed in small type are omitted as occurring in the *Nirukta* by Bloomfield in his *Vedic Concordance*; a few such examples are the following: स्वसुर्जारः शृणोतु नः,[1] printed in small type and without accents in Roth's edition,[2] is not mentioned in VC. as being quoted by Yāska, and similarly—

अभीके चिदु लोककृत्[3]
गातुं कृण्वन्नुषसो जनाय[4]
कुत्साय मन्मन्नह्यश्च[5]
वया इव रुरुहुः सप्त विस्रुहः[6]

and also षळर आहुरर्पितम्, a fragment of RV. I. 164. 12, and quoted in the *Nirukta* 4. 27, and गभस्तिपूतः, a fragment of VS. 7. 1, quoted in N. 5. 6, are ignored. (Besides the reference of परं मृत्यो अनुपरेहि पन्थाम्[7] is wrong in VC.[8] It is quoted in N. 11. 7, and not in N. 10. 7, as stated there. Also the reference to वीहि शूर पुरोळाशम्[9] is wrong in VC.,[10] where it is RV. III. 46. 3, while the correct reference is RV. III. 41. 3. Other cases are: ऊर्व इव पप्रथे कामो अस्मे, RV. III. 30. 19 c, is wrongly given as IV. 30. 19c in VC, cf. p. 285 a; the reference of श्येनो न दीयन्नन्वेति पाथः is wrongly given as IX. 63. 5 b in VC., p. 936 b, while the correct reference is VII. 63. 5 b.)

The Bib. Ind. Edition of the Nirukta.

This was published at Calcutta under the editorship of *Sāmaśrami* from 1882–91. Its chief merit is that it, for the first time, supplies us with the commentary of *Devarāja Yajvan* on the *Nighaṇṭu* and of *Durga* on the *Nirukta*. It also adds an index to the words of the *Nighaṇṭu* as well as to the words of the *Nirukta*. The practical utility of this index, however, suffers much from its being separated into three indexes, one for each volume and not consisting of one single whole. Besides many misprints and errors of *Sandhi*, the text constituted is not very valuable from the critical point of view, and is thus not a trustworthy basis for further research. The editor, although his text generally agrees with the shorter

[1] RV. vi. 55. 5; N. iii. 16; VC., p. 1052 b.
[2] Roth's ed., p. 60.
[3] RV. x. 133. 1; N. iii. 20; Roth's ed., p. 62; VC., p. 95 b.
[4] RV. iv. 51. 1: N. iv. 25; Roth's ed., p. 74; VC., p. 346 b.
[5] RV. iv. 138. 1; N. iv. 25; *loc. cit.*, VC., p. 828 b.
[6] RV. vi. 7. 6; N. vi. 3; Roth's ed., p. 91; VC., p. 839 b.
[7] RV. x. 81. 1; N. xi. 7.
[8] Cf. Bloomfield, *Vedic Concordance*, p. 566 b.
[9] RV. iii. 41. 3; N. iv. 19.
[10] Cf. p. 897 b.

recension, does not seem to realize that there are two recensions of the text of the *Nirukta*, and has thus unconsciously introduced an element of eclecticism in his edition. For instance, he omits the phrase: आचार्यः कस्मात् (vol. ii, p. 49), probably on account of its being not found in the manuscripts of the shorter recension, but he puts the line सुवासाः कल्याणवासाः कामयमाना ऋतुकालेषु (vol. ii, p. 132) within brackets in his constituted text, although it is omitted by manuscripts of the shorter recension. Further, he omits the passage: वृत्वा चां तिष्ठतीति वा चा चीयते र्निवासकर्मणः from his text, adding it in a foot-note with the remark: इत्यधिकः पाठः (vol. ii, p. 181). This shows that he does not follow any general plan with regard to the additional passages of the longer recension, as he sometimes puts them within brackets in the text itself, and sometimes adds them in foot-notes. This would also imply that he does not regard the passage, which he puts within brackets, as interpolations, but only those which he adds in foot-notes; this, to say the least of it, is altogether an arbitrary distinction, made with reference to the additional passages of the longer recension. Further, he is not consistent even in this, for occasionally he puts passages of the shorter recension within brackets as well (see vol. iii, pp. 121–22). Examples might be multiplied. Both these editions (i.e. Roth and Bib. Ind.) are very meagrely punctuated, and many sentences, being not properly divided, are misleading or tend to be obscure.

The Bombay Edition.

Another excellent edition of the *Nirukta*, together with Durga's commentary, is that of Mahāmahopādhyāya, P. Śivadatta, published at Bombay in 1912. In type, in paper, and in general get-up it marks a distinct improvement on its predecessors. The sentences are intelligently divided, and, to a great extent, the obscurities due to defective punctuation in previous editions have been removed. The text followed is that of the longer recension, and the criticism to which Roth's text is subject, except his inconsistency with regard to the use of large and small type, is applicable to the Bombay edition as well. The editor does not state whether he uses any manuscripts or not in the constitution of his text. As a matter of fact, as expressly mentioned in his introductory remarks, he has taken the two previous editions as the basis of his own work. A critical edition of the *Nirukta* professing to represent the archetype as closely as possible, and based on the manuscript material hitherto not utilized is therefore still a *desideratum*. I have, on these grounds, undertaken to edit the *Nirukta* afresh.

Detailed Description of Manuscripts.[1]

MS. *Max Müller Memorial, e. 8.* M 1.

PART I. A.D. 1749.

Contents: The *Nirukta* of Yāska in the longer recension, the text of which consists of two manuscripts, containing the two parts (the *pūrvārdha* and the *uttarārdha*) respectively. The work is divided into chapters (*adhyāyas*) and sections (*khaṇḍas*) thus: Chapter I, which contains 20 sections, begins on f. 1 v. and ends on f. 10 r. Chapter II, 28 sections, ends on f. 21 r. Chapter III, 22 sections, ends on f. 32 v. Chapter IV has 27 sections, and ends on f. 42 v. Chapter V, 28, sections, ends on f. 53 v. Chapter VI, 36 sections, ends on f. 68 r. The chapters are written consecutively, and at the end of each chapter there is added a short summary, quoting the first word or words of every section—thus indicating and also expressly stating the number of sections in the chapter. The text is bounded on both sides by double red lines, sometimes carelessly drawn, regularly up to f. 25 r., after which similar red lines only occasionally appear. A short red vertical stroke is placed above the letter where it indicates the application of the rules of euphonic combination, and is also used to mark the termination of a sentence, being thus a sign of punctuation. The *daṇḍa* appears at the end of a section only, but also points out the beginning and ending of a quotation. The red vertical stroke is often confusing as the accent in Vedic quotations is also marked with red ink.

There are two figures drawn vertically in red ink on f. 1 r. One looks like a goddess, probably *Durgā*, seated in a chariot with a flying banner, the other is the god *Ganeśa*, seated on an ornamented lotus, to which is added in black ink the representation of a small bird, probably a peacock. The two figures contain between them the words: (*sic*) ॥ निरक्ते पुर्वषट् प्रारंभः ॥ An attempt has been made to colour ff. 14, 29, 42, 49, 64 with yellow pigment, which is frequently used also to obliterate, though only with partial success, individual words, syllables, and letters. Black pigment is also employed to obliterate, for instance on f. 24 v., where half a line is completely covered. The manuscript is neat, well preserved, and accurate. It is the best among those belonging to the longer recension.

[1] From the point of view of the general reader, the detailed description of the manuscripts can be much curtailed. But as the manuscripts of the Max Müller Memorial and Chandra Shum Shere collections have not been so far catalogued, this description, in addition to supplying information with regard to the manuscripts material available for a critical edition, is also intended to serve the purpose of a descriptive catalogue. And as Professor A. A. Macdonell is in favour of it, I have retained the whole of it, without any curtailment.

Size: 8¾″ × 3¾″.
Material: Paper.
Number of leaves: ii. + 68.
Number of lines per folio: 9; ff. 3 v.–13 v. have 10 lines each.
Character: Devanāgarī.
Date: On fol. 68 r.: (*sic*) सके १६७१ (= A.D. 1749 प्रमाथीनामसंवत्सरे आश्वीनवद्यतृतीयाह्निने लिखितं (i.e. finished on the third day in the first fortnight of the month of Āśvan).

Scribe: On f. 68 r.: (*sic*) कासीनाथ अनंत पुस्तकं लिख्यते श्री सदाशिवार्पणमस्तु ॥ ॥ श्री ॥ छ ॥. He seems to be a faithful copyist, for he remarks (*sic*):

यादृशं पुस्तकं दृष्ट्वा तादृशं लिखितं मया ।
यदि शुद्धमशुद्धं वा मम दोष न विद्यते ॥

Peculiarity of spelling: *t* is doubled in conjunction, e.g. *tya* = *ttya*.

PART II. A. D. 1775.

Contents: The *Nirukta* of Yāska, Chapters VII–XIII, in the longer recension. The text is divided into chapters (*adhyāyas* and *khaṇḍas*), and sections thus: Chapter VII has 31 sections, begins on f. 1 v. and ends on f. 11 r. Chapter VIII has 22 sections, and ends on f. 16 r. Chapter IX has 43 sections, and ends on f. 24 r. Chapter X has 47 sections, and ends on f. 33 r. Chapter XI has 50 sections, and ends on f. 43 v. Chapter XII has 46 sections, and ends on f. 54 v. Chapter XIII has 50 sections, and ends on f. 70 r. The so-called two chapters of the *pariśiṣṭa* are treated as one. All the chapters are written consecutively without a break. Chapter VII begins with श्री गणेशाय नमः ॥ श्री वेदपुरुषाय नमः ॥ Chapters VIII and X begin with ॥ हरिः ओ३म् ॥ Chapter IX with ॥ श्री हरिः ओ३म् ॥ Chapter XI with छ ॥ श्री विठलप्रसन्न ॥ छ ॥ Chapter XII with ॥ ॐ ॥, and Chapter XIII with ॥ श्री ॥ ॐ ॥. Sect. 14 of the thirteenth chapter also begins with ॥ ॐ ॥ The last word of the 13th section of the same chapter is repeated. At the end of each chapter a short summary, which quotes the first word or words of each section and states the number of sections in the chapter, is subjoined. The text is bounded on both sides by double red lines from f. 11 r. to f. 33 v. Punctuation is similar to that of Part I. Ff. 6 r.–10 v. do not give the Vedic stanza in full in the text itself, where the first few words only of the stanza are written, while the remaining part of the stanza is added in the margin. Black pigment is used to obliterate a part of the line on ff. 60 v. and 63 r. F. 66 is coloured light blue. This is also a neat, well-preserved, and accurately written manuscript.

Size: 8¾″ × 3¾″, and after f. 32, 8½″ × 3¾″.

Material: Paper.
Number of leaves: 70 + ii blank.
Number of lines per folio: 9.
Character: Devanāgarī.

Date: On f. 70 r. (*sic*) संवत् १८॥३१ (= A.D. 1775) विश्वावसु संवत्सरे चैत्र शु १३ (i.e. finished on the thirteenth day of the bright fortnight of the month of *Caitra*).

Scribe: On f. 70 r.: भृगुविश्वनाथभट्ट.

Although these two parts are brought together in the same volume in order to make up the text of the *Nirukta* they are not related to each other except in so far as they both belong to the longer recension. They were copied at different times as their respective dates show. And the fact that the first part uses the Śaka era, while the second, the Vikrama era, indicates that the former comes from the south, while the latter from the north. For the sake of convenience I have used the sign M 1 for both these parts.

MS. *Max Müller Memorial, d. 23.* M 2.

Contents: The first half (Chapters I–VI) of the *Nirukta* in the longer recension. The text is divided into chapters and sections thus: Chapter I begins with श्री गणेशाय नमः ॥ on f. 1 v., has 20 sections, and ends on f. 10 r. Chapter II has 28 sections, and ends on f. 19 r. Chapter III has 22 sections, and ends on f. 27 v. Chapter IV has 27 sections, and ends on f. 35 v. Chapter V has 28 sections, and ends on f. 44 r. Chapter VI has 36 sections, and ends on f. 55 v. The text is bounded on both sides by double red lines. Punctuation is similar to M 1. The Vedic stanzas are not given in full, but the word ऋक् is added after the first two or three words of the quotation thus: f. 5 r. अक्षण्वंतः कर्णवन्तः ॥ ऋक् ॥ In *Saṁdhi* the sign of the elision of short *a* is retained, but not always, e.g. f. 2 r. वर्धतेऽपचीयते and जायतेऽस्ति, *loc. cit.* Ff. 5, 10, 15, 20, 25, 30, 35, 40, 45, 50, i.e. every fifth except the last is coloured with yellow pigment.

It is a very neat and beautifully written and modern manuscript.
Size 10¾″ × 4½″.
Material: Paper.
Number of leaves: ii + 55 + ii blank.
Number of lines: 9.
Character: Devanāgarī.
Date: Not given, but looks modern.
Scribe: Not known.
The colophon runs: इति निरुक्ते षष्ठोऽध्यायः ॥ शुभं भवतु ॥

MS. *Max Müller Memorial, d. 24.* M 3.

Contents: The *Nirukta* of Yāska in the shorter recension. The *pariśiṣṭa* is treated as one chapter, and all the 13 chapters are written consecutively, the *pūrvārdha* being separated from the *uttarārdha* only by the words: (*sic*) ॥ इति चर्द्धः ॥ The text is divided into *adhyāyas*, *pādas*, and *khaṇḍas* thus: Chapter I begins on f. 1 v. with the words ॥ श्री गणेशाय नम: ॥ has 4 *pādas*, which end on ff. 3 r., 7 r., 9 v., and 11 v. respectively.

The sections are numbered continuously—the numbering of sections in each *pāda* being not afresh, but the continuation from the previous section —thus Chapter I has 27 sections; the 1st *pāda* comes to an end after the 5th section; 2nd *pāda* after the 15th section; the 3rd *pāda* after the 21st section; and the 4th *pāda* after the 27th section. Chapter II has 7 *pādas*: 1st *pāda* has 7 sections, and end on f. 14 r.; 2nd *pāda* has 5 sections, and ends on f. 16 r.; 3rd *pāda* has 3 sections, and ends on f. 17 r. (where it is wrongly stated । तृतीयस्यार्द्धः ।); 4th *pāda* has 7 sections, and ends on f. 18 v.; 5th *pāda* has 3 sections, and ends on f. 19 v.; 6th *pāda* has 5 sections, and ends on f. 21 r.; 7th *pāda* has 6 sections, and ends on f. 23 v. Sections in this chapter are not numbered continuously, but at the end of the chapter; the total number of the sections is stated thus: (*sic*) सप्तमः पादः । खांडकां ३६ । द्वितीयोध्यायः. Chapter III has 4 *pādas*; the 1st *pāda* has 7 sections, and ends on f. 26 r.; the 2nd *pāda* has 6 sections, and ends on f. 29 v.; the 3rd *pāda* has 6 sections, and ends on f. 32 r.; the 4th *pāda* has 6 sections, and ends on f. 35 r. As in Chapter II, the total number of .sections is stated to be 25. Chapter IV has 4 *pādas*; the 1st *pāda* has 8 sections, and ends on f. 37 v.; the 2nd *pāda* has 8 sections, and ends on f. 40 r; the 3rd *pāda* has 6 sections, and ends on f. 43 r; the 4th *pāda* has 7 sections, and ends on f. 45 v. As before, the total number of sections is given in the colophon on f. 45 v. as 29. Chapter V has 4 *pādas*; the 1st *pāda* has 6 sections, and ends on f. 48 v.; the 2nd *pāda* has 8 sections, and ends on f. 51 v.; the 3rd *pāda* has 7 sections, and ends on f. 54 r.; the 4th *pāda* has 10 sections, and ends on f. 57 v.; the total number of sections being given as 31. Chapter VI has 5 *pādas*; the 1st *pāda* has 5 sections, and ends on f. 60 r.; the 2nd *pāda* has 13 sections, and ends on f. 65 v.; the 3rd *pāda* has 8 sections, and ends on f. 68 v.; the 4th *pāda* has 5 sections, and ends on f. 70 v.; the 5th *pāda* has 8 sections, and ends on f. 73 v.; the total number of sections, i. e. 39, being added in the colophon, which runs as follows: (*sic*) पंचमः पादः ॥ षष्ठोध्यायः । षांडकां ३९ ॥ छ ॥ ६ ॥ इति चर्द्धः ॥ Chapter VII has 7 *pādas*; the 1st *pāda* has 5 sections, and ends on f. 75 v.: the 2nd *pāda* has 3 sections, and ends on f. 76 v. (wrongly numbered

as 75 on the restored part); the 3rd *pāda* has 10 sections, and ends on f. 79 r.; the 4th *pāda* has 5 sections, and ends on f. 80 v.; the 5th *pāda* has 3 sections, and ends on f. 81 v.; the 6th *pāda* has 9 sections, and ends on f. 83 v.; the 7th *pāda* has 9 sections, and ends on f. 86 v.; the total number of sections, i.e. 44, is added in the colophon. Chapter VIII has 3 *pādas*; the 1st *pāda* has 4 sections, and ends on f. 88 r.; the 2nd *pāda* has 12 sections, and ends on f. 91 v.; the 3rd *pāda* has 7 sections, and ends on f. 93 v.; the total number of sections, 23, is stated in the colophon as before. Chapter IX has 4 *pādas*; the 1st *pāda* has 10 sections, and ends on f. 96 r.; the 2nd *pāda* has 11 sections, and ends on f. 98 v.; the 3rd *pāda* has 13 sections, and ends on f. 102 r.; the 4th *pāda* has 9 sections, and ends on f. 104 r.; the total number of sections being 43. Chapter X has 4 *pādas*; the 1st *pāda* has 13 sections, and ends on f. 108 r.; the 2nd *pāda* has 11 sections, and ends on f. 110 v.; the 3rd *pāda* has 13 sections, and ends on f. 114 r.; the 4th *pāda* has 10 sections, and ends on f. 116 v.; the total number of sections being 47. Chapter XI has 4 *pādas*; the 1st *pāda* has 12 sections, and ends on f. 119 r.; the 2nd *pāda* has 9 sections, and ends on f. 121 v.; the 3rd *pāda* has 13 sections, and ends on f. 125 r. (the colophon is completely obliterated with black pigment); the 4th *pāda* has 16 sections, and ends on f. 128 v.; the total number of sections being 50. Chapter XII has 4 *pādas*; the 1st *pāda* has 11 sections, and ends on f. 131 v.; the 2nd *pāda* has 8 sections, and ends on f. 133 v.; the 3rd *pāda* has 15 sections, and ends on f. 136 v.; the 4th *pāda* has 12 sections, and ends on f. 140 r.; the total number of sections, as stated in the colophon, is 46. Chapter XIII, written consecutively, has 4 *pādas*; the 1st *pāda* has 13 sections—the last word of the 13th section is repeated, a sign of the termination of the chapter—and ends on f. 144 r.; the 2nd *pāda* has 19 sections, and ends on f. 152 v.; the 3rd *pāda* has 9 sections, and ends on f. 155 r.; the 4th *pāda* has 7 sections, and ends on f. 157 v.

It marks the accent not only on Vedic stanzas, but on fragments of Vedic quotations also, several words preceding the quotation are similarly marked. The *daṇḍa* appears at the end of a section, or the beginning and end of a quotation.

Size: 9½″ × 3½″.
Material: Paper.
Number of leaves: ii + 157 + ii blank.
Number of lines: 8; f. 157 has 9 lines.
Character: Devanāgarī.
Date: Not given, but rather old.
Scribe: Not known.

Injuries: It is a very much injured manuscript; f. 12 is torn on the left-hand side, and the text is restored on a patched-up piece of paper; a part of ff. 23 and 52 is injured and the text is similarly restored; on f. 153 v. and 154 v. the right half is restored; f. 157 is restored in a different handwriting. Besides, the leaves are torn in innumerable marginal spaces, but without injuring the text.

Peculiarity of spelling: It has preserved the old calligraphy. Some of the chief peculiarities are: ध् with आ is sometimes written as ध्म; e.g. f. 1 v., line 5, प्रधान is written प्रध्मन. Cf. also f. 1 v., line 6.

ऐ is written as ाए; e.g. f. 1 v., line 5, तचे = ताचे; f. 2 v., line 1, तेनैव = ॰तोनेव; f. 63 r., line 2, नैरुक्ताः = ानेरुक्ताः, and so on.

ए is occasionally written as ।/, e.g. f. 2 r, line 5, वेदे = वेाद and आयति = आयात, line 6, वर्धते = वर्धात; f. 2 v., line 8, व्यपेत्येतस्स = व्यपेात्यतस्स.

But in the case of ए this method is not always adhered to; occasionally ए is written in the ordinary way, e.g., f. 2 v., line 5, चर्वागर्थे and not चर्वागार्थ; f. 2 v., line 7, पुजितार्थे and not पुजितार्थ; f. 63 r., line 2, यद्न्ये and not यद्ान्य, व्ययेयुः and not व्याययुः.

ओ is written as ाओ, e.g., f. 2 r., line 1, गौः = ागोः, line 2, वचनमौदुंबरायणः = वचनामोदुंबरायणः, line 8, सांयौगिकानां = संायोगिकानां.

Occasionally प is written like य, and the sign of उ in conjunction is added, not at the bottom, but on the side of a letter; e.g., f. 1 v., line 3, इत्यौपमन्यवो = इत्यौयमन्यवो; but f. 2 r, line 1. पुरुषो is written in the ordinary way; f. 1 v., line 3, स्युः = स्यः.

त् is written as a short horizontal stroke in conjunction with other letters; e.g., f. 1 v., line 4, चत्वारि = चत्वारि, line 6, सत्व = सत्व; f. 2 r, line 5, चनित्यत्वात्कर्म॰ = चनित्यत्वात्कर्म॰; f. 1 v., line 7, मूर्त्तं = मूर्त्तं.

त् is occasionally written as a short horizontal stroke, even when it is not a conjunct consonant; e.g., f. 2 r., line 2, चतुर्ष्टं = चतुर्ष्टं, but in conjunction with य it is written in the ordinary way; e.g., cf. चनित्य above, and प्रभृत्य॰, f. 1 v., line 6. There is dittography also, e.g., f. 2 r., line 3, युगपदुत्पन्नानां.

The manuscript belongs to a period when calligraphy was still in a process of transition, consequently it preserves the old and new forms of letters side by side; it cannot therefore be later than the fifteenth century. I think that among the manuscripts of the *Nirukta* in the Bodleian this is the oldest and best manuscript belonging to the shorter recension.

MS. *Max Müller Memorial, e. 9.* M 4.

Contents: The *Nirukta* (7–14 chapters; the *pariśiṣṭa* is treated as two chapters) in the longer recension. The text is punctuated with a short and vertical stroke, indicating *Saṁdhi* and the termination of a sentence, while the *daṇḍa* appears at the end of a section, or the commencement and end of a quotation. Accent is marked with red ink in Vedic quotations. The work is divided into chapters and sections, thus: Chapter VII begins with ॥ श्री गणेशाय नमः ॥ हरिः ॐम् ॥ on f. 1 v., has 31 sections, and ends on f. 15 v. Chapter VIII has 22 sections, and ends on f. 23 v.; Chapter IX has 43 sections, and ends on f. 35 r. Chapter X has 47 sections, and ends on f. 49 r. Chapter XI has 50 sections, and ends on f. 61 v. Chapter XII has 46 sections, and ends on f. 75 r. Chapter XIII has 13 sections, and ends on f. 79 v. Chapter XIV has 37 sections, and ends on f. 96 r. All the 14 chapters are written consecutively, and at the end of each chapter a summary similar to that described on p. 1 is added.

Size: 11″ × 5″.
Material: paper.
Number of leaves: ii + 96 + ii blank.
Number of lines: 7.
Character: Devanāgarī.
Date: Not given.
Scribe: Not known.

The colophon on f. 96 r. runs as follows: ॥ इति निरुक्ते परिशिष्टचतुर्दशो-ध्यायः ॥ १४ ॥ श्री रामजयरामजयजयराम श्री ॥

It is a neat, well-written, fairly accurate, and modern manuscript.

MS. *Chandra Shum Shere, d. 178.* C 1.

The text of the *Nirukta* is made up of two different manuscripts, which contain Chapters I–VI and VII–XII respectively, but both are incomplete, and both belong to the longer recension. The two parts are separated by a fragment of a third manuscript (ff. 38–43), which gives a part of Chapters XI and XII. The fragment has no value for the purpose of collation, and is therefore ignored.

PART I.

Contents: The *Nirukta* (Chapters I–VI) in the longer recension. The text is divided into chapters and sections thus: Chapter I begins on f. 1 v., has 20 sections, and ends on f. 7 v; Chapter II has 28 sections, and ends on f. 12 r.; Chapter III has 22 sections, and ends on f. 18 v.;

Chapter IV has 27 sections, and ends on f. 25 r.; Chapter V has 28 sections, and ends on f. 30 r.; Chapter VI has 35 sections only, the remaining sections are missing. The text is bounded on both sides by double red lines ff. 1–21; by double black lines ff. 11 r, 17 v, and 22–36; f. 12 is written in a different handwriting. The accent is marked in red ink in Vedic stanzas only. Double short vertical red strokes are used to indicate *sandhi* and the end of a sentence, which are replaced by similar black strokes from f. 7 v.–f. 12 r., which are again replaced by a similar single red stroke ff. 19–30. The *daṇḍa*, as usual, appears at the end of a section only, or at the commencement and the termination of a quotation. The chapters are written consecutively. Numerous notes are added on the margin, and sometimes between the lines of the text also, e.g. ff. 2, 3, 12, 18 v., 19. At the end of each chapter a short summary, as described on page 1, is subjoined:

Size 13″ × 5″.

Material: paper.

Number of leaves: 1 + 36 + i blank.

Number of lines: 10 ff. 1–25; 11 ff. 26–36.

Character: Devanāgarī.

Date: The last leaves of the manuscript are missing; neither the date nor the name of the scribe is known. From its appearance the manuscript looks old, f. 8 is numbered as f. 9, and f. 9 as f. 11, and the mistake continues up to the end; the reference to folios are therefore to the number added in pencil.

Injuries: It is injured in many places, e.g. ff. 7–12 on the top (left).

PART II.

Contents: The *uttarārdha* of the *Nirukta* (Chapters VII–XII) in the longer recension. The text is divided into chapters and sections thus: Chapter VII begins on f. 1 v. with the words ॥ श्री गणेशाय नमः ॥ ॐ ॥ has 31 sections, and ends on f. 11 r (= f. 54 r.); Chapter VIII has 22 sections, and ends on f. 15 v. (= f. 58 v.); Chapter IX has 43 sections, and ends on f. 23 v. (= f. 66 v.); Chapter X has 47 sections, and ends on f. 32 r. (= f. 75 r.); Chapter XI has 30 sections, and ends on f. 40 v. (= f. 83 v.); Chapter XII has 43 sections only, and ends on f. 48 v. (= f. 91 v.); the remaining portion of the manuscript is missing. All the chapters are written consecutively, and at the end of each chapter a summary similar to that of Part I is added. The text is bounded on both sides by two sets on double black lines, ff. 1–34 (ff. 44–77) and ff. 41–48 (ff. 84–91); and by similar red lines ff. 35–40 (ff. 78–83). The accent is marked in red ink in Vedic stanzas

only, and a short vertical red stroke is occasionally used for punctuation; the use of the *daṇḍa* is similar to that of Part I. F. 9 (= f. 52) is written in a different handwriting.

Size: $11\frac{9}{10}'' \times 4\frac{1}{2}''$.
Material: paper.
Number of leaves: 48 + i blank.
Number of lines: 9–10.
Character: Devanāgarī.
Date: The last part of the manuscript is missing; consequently the date and the name of the scribe are not known.

Injuries: ff. 18 (= 61), 34–40 (= 77–83) are slightly injured in the top margin; f. 22 (= 65) is practically defaced by black and yellow ink, and f. 28 (= 71) by water.

MS. *Chandra Shum Shere, d. 181.* C 2.

The text is made up of two different manuscripts.

PART I.

Contents: The *pūrvārdha* of the *Nirukta* in the longer recension. The manuscript is fragmentary and incomplete, containing Chapters I, IV, V, and a part of the first section of the VI. The text is divided into chapters and sections. Chapter I has 20 sections, and ends on f. 13 v. Chapter IV has 27 sections, and ends on f. 26 r. Chapter V has 28 sections, and ends on f. 40 r. The accent is marked in red ink in Vedic stanzas only, while a short vertical red stroke is used for punctuation. The words (*sic*) इति नीरुक्ते पुर्वषट्के प्रथमोध्यायः ॥ are wrongly added at the bottom of f. 1 v. in a different handwriting. F. 1 r. has a figure of Gaṇeṣa drawn rather crudely in red with two female attendants.

Size: $13\frac{1}{8}'' \times 5\frac{1}{2}''$.
Material: paper.
Number of leaves: i + 40.
Number of lines: 7–8.
Character: Devanāgarī.
Date and scribe: Not known.

Injuries: ff. 13–14 are slightly injured by worms. It looks modern. The numbering in the original is wrong; the reference is to the number added in pencil. It is full of mistakes.

Peculiarity of spelling: f. 2, l. 1 प्रज्या is written as प्रर्ज्य, f. 2, l. 1 गौ is written as गैं.

Part II.

Contents: The *uttarārdha* of the *Nirukta* (Chapters VII–XIII) in the longer recension. The text is divided into chapters and sections thus: Chapter VII has 31 sections, and ends on f. 6 v. (= 46 v.); the colophon adds: श्री रामो जयतितरां ॥ छ ॥ Chapter VIII has 22 sections, and ends on f. 10 r. (= 50 r.); Chapter IX has 43 sections, and ends on f. 15 r. (= 55 r.); Chapter X has 47 sections, and ends on f. 20 v (= 60 v.); Chapter XI has 50 sections, and ends on f. 26 v. (= 66 v.); Chapter XII has 46 sections, and ends on f. 32 r. (= 72 r.); Chapter XIII begins on f. 32 v. (= 72 v.), has 13 sections, and ends on f. 34 v. (= 74 v.); the colophon runs (*sic*) ॥ इति निरुक्ते उत्तरषट्के सप्तमोध्यायः ॥ छ ॥ शुभं भवतु ॥ छ ॥ श्री महागणपतये नमः ॥ the last chapter, which is also named XIII, has 37 sections, which are not numbered anew, but continuously from the previous section, and ends on f. 42 r. (= 82 r.). Chapters VIII–XII are written consecutively, and a summary, similar to the one described on p. 1, is added at the end of each chapter, but the summary on f. 42 r. (= 82 r.) also includes that of the first 13 sections, although the summary of these sections is already subjoined on f. 34 v. (= 74 v.).

The colophon on f. 42 r (= 82 r) runs thus: ॥ इति निरुक्ते चयोदशोध्यायः ॥ The text is bounded on both sides by double black lines, ff. 1–23 (= 41–63) and ff. 38–42 (=78–82) by similar red lines, ff. 24–36 (=64–76), f. 37 (=77) is coloured yellow. A short vertical red stroke is employed for punctuation, the dropping of *visarga* is indicated by adding them on the top of the letter just before the red stroke, e.g. f. 1 v. (= 41 v.), l. 3: प्रत्यक्षकृताँ आध्यात्मि° ; *op. cit.* l. 4: पृथिव्याँ इंद्रम° ; *op. cit.* l. 8: °पुरुषयोगाँ चाहमिति, and so on.

Occasionally the short red stroke is written ।ऽ, but the sign ऽ is not meant to point out the elision of short *a*, e.g. *op. cit.* l. 5: प्रवोऽर्चमिंद्रे. Sometimes ऽ is replaced by ×. The *daṇḍa* appears at the end of a section, or at the beginning and end of a quotation. The accent is marked in red ink on Vedic stanzas.

Size: 13½″ × 5⅗″.
Material: paper.
Number of leaves: 42 + i blank.
Number of lines: 12–17.
Character: Devanāgarī.
Date and scribe: Not known.
Injuries: f. 1 (= 41), ff. 21–22 (= 61–22), f. 23 (= 63) are slightly injured.
It is a neat, but closely written manuscript.

MS. *Chandra Shum Shere, d. 182.* C 3.

The text of the *Nirukta* is made up of two manuscripts.

PART I.

Contents: The *pūrvārdha* of the *Nirukta* in the longer recension. The work is divided into chapters and sections thus: Chapter I begins on f. 1 v. with the words: (*sic*) श्री गणेश । श्री रामाय नमः, has 20 sections, and ends on f. 7 r. Chapter II has 28 sections, and ends on f. 12 r. (ff. 8–9, containing sections 3–11 of the second chapter, are missing in the original). Chapter III has 22 sections, and ends on f. 18 r. (ff. 19 and 21–23, containing sections 11–12 and 14–19, are missing in the original). Chapter IV has 27 sections, and ends on f. 23 v. Chapter V has 28 sections, and ends on f. 29 v. Chapter VI has 36 sections, and ends on f. 38 r. The chapters are written consecutively, the summary is added as usual, punctuation and accents in Vedic stanzas are marked in red ink. The text is bounded on both sides by double black lines, f. 1 r. has a few laudatory verses written on it and the words: (*sic*) अथ परिशीष्टं ॥ हंस शुचिषदिति । व्हक्.

A part of line 9 on f. 5 r., and of line 4 on f. 7 r., of line 5 on f. 7 v., is obliterated with black pigment. Two lines are added to the top of f. 13 v., f. 19 v. is partially defaced by light red ink, and half a line on f. 20 r. is similarly obliterated with red pigment. Colophon on f. 38 r. runs thus: ॥ इति निरुक्ते पूर्वषट्के षष्ठो ध्यायः ॥ श्री रामचन्द्राय नमः ॥ श्री विश्वेश्वराय नमः ॥ शुभमस्तु ॥ श्री वक्रतुंडाय नमः ॥ A female figure is drawn on f. 38 v., and a list of several articles is added. The prominent difference of ink, characters, carelessness, occasionally disproportionate red vertical strokes, frequent use of red ink for marginal notes, smudging of the black ink, give a very untidy appearance to the manuscript.

Size: $12\frac{1}{2}'' \times 5\frac{3}{10}''$.
Material: Paper.
Number of leaves: i + 38 + i blank.
Number of lines: 10–11.
Character: Devanāgarī.
Date and scribe: Not known.

The name of the owner is given on f. 1 r. as Goḍabole Lakṣmaṇa Bhaṭṭa.

Peculiarity of spelling: It occasionally writes र as न, e.g., f. 1 v., line 1, श्री रामाय = श्री नामाय. Like M 1, it frequently doubles *t* in conjunction with other letters, e.g. f. 1 v., line 2, समाहृत्य = समाहृत्त्य; line 3, इत्यौपमन्यवः = इत्त्यौपमन्यवः; line 4, चत्वारि = चत्त्वारि; line 8, नित्यं = नित्त्यं.

PART II.

Contents: The *uttarārdha* of the *Nirukta* (Chapters X–XIII) in the longer recension. The text is divided into chapters and sections thus: Chapter X begins on f. 1 r. (=40 r.), has 47 sections, and ends on f. 16 v. (= 55 v.). Chapter XI has 50 sections, and ends on f. 31 v. (= 70 v.). These two chapters are written consecutively. Chapter XII begins with ॥श्री गणेशाय नमः॥ has 46 sections, and ends on f. 13 v. (= 83 v.). This seems to be a different manuscript from the previous one containing Chapters X–XI; the pagination begins anew, the handwriting is different, and unlike the former the text is bounded on both sides by double red lines. The *pariśiṣṭa* is separated from Chapter XII, and is treated as one chapter. The numbering of leaves starts anew from the first. It begins with ॥श्री॥, on f. 1 r. (= 84 r.), has 50 sections, and ends on 14 v. (= 97 v.). The last word of the 13th section is repeated, but the summary is added at the end of the 50th section. The summary, as usual, is added at the end of every chapter. The accent is marked in red ink in Vedic quotations, while a short vertical red stroke is used for punctuation. A line in different handwriting is added at the bottom of f. 1 v. (= 40 v.). A line and a half in red ink is added on the right-hand margin of f. 22 r. (= 61 r.); part of the 50th section of the eleventh chapter is finished off on the top and right-hand margin on f. 31 v. (= 70 v.). A line is added on the top of f. 11 v. (= 81 v.). Section 43 of Chapter XIII is left out in the text, but added on the top and the margin on the right on f. 13 r. (= 96 r.).

Size: 9″ × 4″.

Material: Paper.

Number of leaves: 31 + 13 + 12 (= 58) + i blank.

Number of lines: 7 to 9.

Character: Devanāgarī.

Date and scribe: Not known; the colophon runs thus: ॥श्री निरुक्त उत्तरषट्के सप्तमोध्यायः॥

Injuries: It is slightly injured by worms in several places, e.g. ff. 7–4 (= 47–54) and ff. 1–3 (= 84–86).

It has a modern look.

MS. *Chandra Shum Shere, d. 179.* C 4.

The text is made up of two manuscripts, containing the *pūrvārdha* and the *uttarārdha*, with the *pariśiṣṭa* respectively, each being copied by a different scribe, at a different place and period. They will therefore be separately described.

MS. 1. A.D. 1629 Copied at Benares.

Contents: The *pūrvārdha* of the *Nirukta* in the shorter recension; the text is divided into chapters, *pādas*, and sections, thus: Chapter I has 6 *pādas*; the 1st *pāda* contains 5 sections, and ends on f. 2 v.; it is not stated where the 2nd *pāda* comes to an end, probably it should be ended after the 4th section, as the number of the following section begins anew; the 3rd *pāda* has six sections, and ends on f. 6 v.; the 4th *pāda* has 4 sections, and ends on f. 8 r.; the 5th *pāda* has 2 sections, and ends on f. 9 v.; the 6th *pāda* has 6 sections, and ends on f. 11 v.; 27 being the total number of sections given in the colophon, which runs thus: (*sic*) ॥ ६ ॥ २१ ॥ इति नैरुक्ते प्रथमोध्यायस्य षष्ठमः पादः ॥ प्रथमोध्यायः समाप्तः ॥

Chapter II has 7 *pādas*: the 1st *pāda* contains 7 sections, and ends on f. 13 v.; 2nd *pāda* contains 5 sections, and ends on f. 16 r.; 3rd *pāda* contains 3 sections, and ends on f. 17 r.; 4th *pāda* contains 7 sections, and ends on f. 18 v.; 5th *pāda* contains 3 sections, and ends on f. 19 v.; 6th *pāda* contains 5 sections, and ends on f. 21 r.; 7th *pāda* contains 6 sections, and ends on f. 23 r.; the total number of sections being 36. Chapter III has 4 *pādas*: 1st *pāda* contains 7 sections, and ends on f. 25 v.; 2nd *pāda* contains 6 sections, and ends on f. 28 v.; 3rd *pāda* contains 6 sections, f. 30 containing sections 5–6 is missing; 4th *pāda* contains 6 sections, and ends on f. 33 v.; the total number of the sections being 25. Chapter IV has 4 *pādas*: 1st *pāda* has 8 sections, and ends on f. 35 v.; 2nd *pāda* has 8 sections, f. 38 containing a part of the 8th section of the 2nd *pāda*, and the 1–2 sections of the 3rd *pāda* is missing; 3rd *pāda* has 6 sections, and ends on f. 40 v.; 4th *pāda* has 7 sections, and ends on f. 43 v. Chapter V has 4 *pādas*: 1st *pāda* contains 6 sections, and ends on f. 46 r.; 2nd *pāda* contains 8 sections; f. 48 containing sections 6–8 is missing; 3rd *pāda* contains 7 sections, and ends on f. 51 r.; 4th *pāda* contains 10 sections, and ends on f. 54 r.; the total number of sections being 31. Chapter VI has 6 *pādas*: 1st *pāda* contains 5 sections, ending on f. 56 r.; 2nd *pāda* contains 6 sections, and ends on f. 58 r.; 3rd *pāda* contains 7 sections, and ends on f. 61 r.; 4th *pāda* has 8 sections, and ends on f. 64 r.; 5th *pāda* has 5 sections, and ends on f. 66 r.; 6th *pāda* has 8 sections, and ends on f. 68 v.; f. 1 is missing. The text is bounded on both sides by double black lines. Punctuation is similar to that of C 3. Occasionally marginal notes are added in red ink.

Size: $8\frac{3}{10}'' \times 3\frac{4}{5}''$.
Material: paper.
Number of leaves: i + 64.

Number of lines: 10.

Character: Devanāgarī.

Date: on f. 68 v. (= 64 v.): (*sic*) इति संवत् १६८३ वर्षे वैशाखवद्य ४ बुधे (i.e. completed on Wednesday in the former half of the month Vaiśākha A.D. 1627).

Scribe: on f. 68 v. (= 64 v.): (*sic*) च· हाउसुत् च· शिवासुत् च· उंरसुत् च· फफीपुत्र ग्रामेन लखीतं पठनार्थं ॥

Place: on f. 68 v. (= 64 v.): (*sic*) ॥ अविमुक्तवाराणशीमध्ये लषीतं वृद्धनगरवास्तव्यं ॥ गंगायै नमः ॥

Injuries: ff. 1, 30, 38, 48 are missing; f. 22 is injured, and slightly defaced, and f. 33 is defaced by marginal notes.

Peculiarity of spelling: ए is occasionally written as ।/, e.g. f. 2 r. line 2: इतरेतरोपदेशः = इतरेतरोपादशः f. 2 r., line 8: वर्द्धते = वर्द्धात f. 2 v., line 4: प्र परे° = प्र पार° ओ is occasionally written as ।/। e.g. f. 2 v., line 2: नामाख्यातयोः = नामाख्यातायाः but cf. line 3, f. 2 v., line 8: सर्वतो = सर्वाता र is occasionally written in conjunction thus: f. 3 r., line 2: प्रतिषेधार्थीयो = प्रतिषेधाथ्श्यो, line 4: उपमाथ्श्यः

Manuscript containing the *uttarārdha*. A.D. *1691*.
Copied at Dacca.

Contents The second part (Chapters VII–XII) of the *Nirukta* in the shorter recension; the text is divided into chapter, *pāda*, and section. In this division, and the number of *pādas* in a chapter, and that of sections in a *pāda*, it agrees with M 3. The 7 *pādas* of Chapter VII end on ff. 3 r. (= 67 r.), 4 v. (= 68 v.), 7 v. (= 71 v.), 9 r. (= 73 r.), 10 v. (= 74 v.), 13 r. (= 77 r.), 16 v. (= 80 v.) respectively; the 3 *pādas* of Chapter VIII end on ff. 18 r. (= 82 r.), 21 v. (=85 v.) 24 r. (= 88 r.) respectively; the 4 *pādas* of Chapter IX end on ff. 27 v. (= 91 v.); 30 r. (= 94 r.), 33 v. (= 97 v.), 35 v. (= 99 v.) respectively; the 4 *pādas* of Chapter X end on ff. 39 v. (= 103 v.), 42 v. (106 v.), 46 r. (110 r.), 48 v. (= 112 v.) respectively; the 4 *pādas* of Chapter XI end on ff. 51 v. (= 115 v.), 54 r. (= 118 r.), 58 v. (= 122 v.), 62 v. (126 v.) respectively; the 4 *pādas* of Chapter XII end on ff. 65 v. (=129 v.), 68 r. (= 132 r.), 71 v. (= 135 v.), 75 v. (= 139 v.) respectively. f. 56 r. (= 120 r.) is left blank. The text is bounded on both sides by treble black lines. The accent in Vedic quotations is marked in red ink. The short vertical stroke is replaced by a similar black stroke for punctuation. The use of the *daṇḍa* is similar to M 3.

The *pariśiṣṭa* is separated from Chapter XII, and is contained in ff. 76–94 (= 140–158). The division of the text into *pādas* and *Khaṇḍas*

is identical with M 3. The 4 *pādas* of Chapter XIII end on ff. 80 v. (= 144 v.), 89 r. (= 153 r.), 91 v. (= 155 v.), 94 r. (= 158 r.) respectively.

Pagination is continued from the end of Chapter XII. The date given on f. 94 r. (= 158 r.): (*sic*) संव १७४५ वर्षे ज्येठमासे शुक्लपचे १५ गुरुवासरे ॥ cannot be genuine, for it is clear from the numbering of folios that it must have been written after Chapter XII, which was finished in संवत् १७४७; hence, it could not be earlier than १७४७. The name of the scribe is Harirāma, a resident of Muphalīpura. The colophon runs thus: (*sic*) यवेह धोलकामध्ये मुफलीपुरवास्तव्वं वृद्धनगरज्ञातीय पंचोलीडुसासुतक्ष्ण सु॰ हरीहर सु॰ हरीरामेन स्वयं लिषितं.

Size: 9″ × 4″.
Material: Paper.
Number of leaves: 94 + i blank.
Number of lines: 8.
Character: Devanāgarī.
Date: on f. 75 v. (= 139 v.): स्वस्ति श्री संवत् १७४७ (= A. D. 1691) ना वरषे भाद्रुवा वदि ५ बुधे.
Scribe: on f. 75 v. (= 139 v.): दीषत् सोमेश्वर: he seems to have taken great pains in copying the manuscript, for he remarks:

(*sic.*) भग्नपृष्टिकटिग्रीवाबधमुष्टिरधोमुखं ॥
कष्टेन लिखितं ग्रन्थं यत्नेन परिपालयेत् ॥

Place: on f. 75 v. (= 139 v.) (*sic*) ॥ श्री डाकामध्ये लषितंमिदं ॥
Injuries: ff. 1–11 (= 65–75) are slightly defaced.
Peculiarity of spelling: it occasionally writes ऐ as in Part I, e. g.

f. 1 v. (= 65 v.), line 1 दैवतं = ाद्वतं
" " " प्राधान्य॰ = प्राधन्य॰
" " 3 ॰आर्थपत्यम् = आर्थपत्यम्

Some of the figures for numbers are occasionally slightly different: ४ = ऽ।, ५ = च्, ७ = ဎ f. 73 r. (= 137 r.), ची is written as चैं; f. 73 r. (= 137 r.), line 8: श्रोमासः = चैंमासः.

MS. *Chandra Shum Shere, d. 180.* C 5.

The text is made up of two manuscripts which are described separately.

MS. containing the pūrvārdha, A. D. *1758.*

Contents: Chapters I–VI of the *Nirukta* in the shorter recension. The text is divided into *pādas* and sections. It agrees with C[4] in having

six *pādas* in Chapter I. It is carelessly written, and full of mistakes. The text is bounded by double red lines up to f. 24, and by similar black lines, ff. 25–67. Ff. 55 v., 56 are defaced by disproportionate marginal notes. F. 57 is wrongly numbered 56 in the original. The first four lines on the top of f. 58 r. are to be crossed. Two geometrical figures are drawn on f. 1 r.

Size: $8\frac{1}{4}'' \times 4\frac{1}{4}''$.
Material: Paper.
Number of leaves: i + 67.
Number of lines: 7–14.
Character: Devanāgarī.
Date: on f. 67 v. (*sic*) संवत् १८१४ गुर्जरे मीती चै ६च वदि ८ शुक्रे (= A. D. 1758).
Scribe: The name of the owner is added in a different handwriting on f. 67 v.: आ पोथि भामंगबरामसुत् नाथुराम नि छे शुभं भवति (i. e. this book belongs to Nāthurāma, son of Bhāmaṅgabarāma).

MS. containing the uttārardha with the pariśiṣṭa, dated A. D. 1479.

Contents: Chapters VII–XIII of the *Nirukta* in the shorter recension, written consecutively. The text is divided into *pādas* and *Khaṇḍas*, agreeing with C 4 in the number of *pādas* and *Khaṇḍas*, distributed in each chapter and *pāda* respectively. The seven *pādas* end on ff. 2 v. (= 69 v.), 3 v. (= 70 v.), 5 v. (= 72 v.), 7 r. (= 74 r.), 8 r. (= 75 r.), 9 v. (= 76 v.), 12 r. (= 79 r.); the three *pādas* of Chapter VIII on ff. 13 r. (= 80 r.), 16 r. (= 83 r.), 17 v. (= 84 v.); the four *pādas* of Chapter IX on ff. 20 r. (= 87 r.), 22 r. (= 89 r.), 24 v. (= 91 v.), 26 r. (= 93 r.); the four *pādas* of Chapter X on ff. 29 v. (= 96 v.), 31 v. (= 98 v.), 34 v. (= 101 v.), 36 v. (= 103 v.); the four *pādas* of Chapter XI on ff. 39 r. (= 106 r.), 41 r. (= 108 r.), 43 v. (= 110 v.), 46 v. (= 113 v.); the four *pādas* of Chapter XII on ff. 49 r. (= 116 r.), 51 r. (= 118 r.), 54 r. (= 121 r.), 56 v. (= 123 v.); the four *pādas* of Chapter XIII on ff. 60 r. (= 127 r.), 67 r. (= 134 r.), 69 v. (= 136 v.), 71 v. (= 138 v.). The text is bounded on both sides by double black lines. The accent in Vedic stanzas is marked in red ink. Punctuation is similar to M 3. It is a very good manuscript, neat and accurate.

Size: $8\frac{3}{4}'' \times 3\frac{1}{2}''$.
Material: Paper.
Number of leaves: 72 + i blank.
Number of lines: 9.
Character: Devanāgarī.

Date: on f. 71 v. (= 138 v.): ॥ स्वस्ति संवत् १५३५ (= A. D. 1479) वर्षे भाद्रुवा शुदि ११ ऽद्येह.

Scribe: on f. 71 v. (= 138 v.): पीतांबरेण निरुक्तं संपूर्णं लिखितमस्ति ॥ शुभं ॥ The Colophon runs thus: (*sic*) श्री चलिप्राकारे महाराजाधिराय श्री भाखविजयराज्ये आभ्यंतरनागरज्ञातीय संघाटूरूक्ष्पति महायाज्ञक श्री श्री शंकरसुत याज्ञक श्री प्रयागदाससुतः या॰ बडू आमध्ययनार्थं पीतांबरेण &c. The name of the owner is given on f. 72 r. (= 139 r): याज्ञिक श्री प्रयागदाससुतस्य याज्ञिक श्री बडू ज्ञाति पोथि ॥ Rites and sacrifices performed by the owner at various places of pilgrimages like Kurukṣetra, Benares, &c., are enumerated on f. 72 r. (= 139 r.).

Peculiarity of spelling: स is always written as प्त, ए is written as ।/, .g. वर्षे = वार्ष on f. 71 v., line 6.

f. 54 r. (= 121 r.), line 3: देवगणाः = ाद्वगणाः
„ „ „ 4: तेषां = ातषां and so on.

ऐ is written as ।/ए, e. g.

f. 53 v. (= 120 v.), line 9: भवत्वैंग्राम् = भवात्वैंग्राम्
„ „ „ 2: पितैषां = पितेषां and so on.

ओ is written as ।/।, e. g.

f. 53 v. (= 120 v.), line 1: पवित्रवंतो = पवित्रवंाता
„ „ „ 2: पुराणो = पुराणा
„ „ „ 6: मृणोत्सजा॰ = मृाणात्सजा॰.

औ is written as ।/ओ, e. g.

f. 5 r. (= 72 r.), line 6: वेत्वौपमिकम् = ावात्वोपमिकम्

त् in conjunction with य् is written as a short vertical stroke, and with स् or व् as a horizontal stroke, e. g.

प्रेत्य = प्रेय; इत्यपि = इयपि

उत्साह = उसाह; त्व = व and so on.

च is written variously as ङ or ङ or ङ.

Injuries: ff. 9 (= 76), 10 (= 77), 19 (= 86), 29 (= 96) are slightly injured.

MS. *Chandra Shum Shere, e. 61.* C 6.

Contents: The *Nirukta* of Yāska in the longer recension. It consists of three manuscripts; the first contains Chapters I–V in 86 leaves (86 v. gives a part of the first section of Chapter VI); the second, Chapter VI in

27 leaves (numbered in the original as 47–73 = 87–113); the third, Chapters VII–XIV, in 78 leaves (= 114–191). The division of the text into Chapters (*adhyāya*) and sections (*Khaṇḍas*), the punctuation, and the method of marking the accent in Vedic stanzas are identical with M 4. The text is bounded by double red lines only occasionally. F. 3 is replaced by a leaf in a later handwriting. Ff. 87–92 are written on blue paper. A summary similar to M 4 is added at the end of each chapter.

Size: 8¼″ × 4″ (ff. 1–86) and 7¾″ × 3¾ (ff. 87–113), 7½″ × 3¼″ (ff. 114–191).
Material: Paper.
Character: Devanāgarī.
Number of leaves: i + 191 + i blank.
Number of lines: 7 (ff. 1–113), 7–10 (ff. 114–191).
Date and Scribe: Not known.

The name of the owner is added on f. 114 r.: ॥ इदं पुस्तकं पटवृषवीरेश्वर-भट्टस्येदं पुस्तकं योगीश्वर्यै नमः ॥

MS. *Chandra Shum Shere, d. 183.* C 7.

Contents: The *uttarārdha* of the *Nirukta*, Chapters VII–XI, and sections 1–27 of Chapter XII in the shorter recension. The text is bounded by treble black lines on both sides, and is divided into *pādas* and *Khaṇḍas*. The numbering of sections does not begin anew in each *pāda*, but is consecutive for the whole chapter, and agrees with the manuscripts of the longer recension. It looks old; the ink is totally effaced in several parts, which makes it difficult to read; but it is not really old, for it does not display any characteristics of old writing. It is full of mistakes. Three lines are added at the bottom on f. 13 v., 52 v. Marginal notes are occasionally written.

Size: 9¾″ × 3½″.
Material: Paper.
Number of leaves: i + 58 + i blank.
Number of lines per folio: 7.
Character: Devanāgarī.
Date and Scribe: Not known, for the last leaves are missing.

Peculiarity of spelling: त् is occasionally written as a short horizontal stroke in conjunction. F. 1 v., line 1; ॰स्तुतीनां = ॰स्तुतीनां, f. 1 v., line 2: स्तुतिं = स्तुतिं. म् is doubled in conjunction with र्, e.g. कर्मे = कर्म्मे. F. 58 v. is torn in two.

MS. *Wilson 488.* W 1.

Yāska's Nirukta, A.D. *1768.*

This is described in detail by Keith in the *Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts*, vol. ii, p. 107. His description may be supplemented by the following: the Colophon on f. 79 v. runs thus: (*sic*) ॥ श्री ॥

मंगलं लेखकानां च पाठकानां च मंगलं ।
मंगलं सर्वजंतुनां मंगलं सर्वमंगलं ॥
यादृशं पुस्तकं दृष्ट्वा तादृशं लिखितं मया
यदि शुद्धमशुद्धं वा मम दोषो न दीयतां ॥२॥

Two more verses are added in a different hand, one being a slight modification of a verse from the *Pañcatantra*. The *pūrvārdha* and the *uttarārdha* are written in different hands.

Peculiarity of spelling: ल् and त् are occasionally doubled in conjunction with र्, e.g.

f. 1 v., line 7: °तयोर्लक्षणं = तयोर्ल्लक्षणं
f. 2 r., „ 2: मूर्ते = मूर्त्ते

Number of lines per folio: 7 (ff. 1–21), 9 (ff. 22–79), 7 (ff. 80–162), 8 (ff. 163–183).

Injuries: Ff. 53–63 are slightly injured by worms on the left marginal top.

MS. *Wilson 491.* W 2.

This manuscript is described in detail by Keith in the *Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library*, vol. ii, p. 106. His description may be supplemented as follows:

Peculiarity of spelling: It writes धा as घ्न

ए is occasionally written as ।/, e.g. वर्धेत = वर्धात
ऐ „ „ „ „ ।/ए, „ तचैतं = ताचेतं
ओ „ „ „ „ ।/।, „ मंचो = मांचा
औ „ „ „ „ ।/ओ, „ सांयोगिक = सांयोगिक

Number of lines per folio: 8 (ff. 1–61), 9 (ff. 62–78), 8 (ff. 79–91), 9 (ff. 92–101), it varies from 10–11 (ff. 102–130).

F. 104 is upside down. The size of leaves (ff. 79–86) is: $8\frac{3}{4}'' \times 3\frac{1}{2}''$. Ff. 79–130 are written in a handwriting different from that of the previous folios.

MS. *Wilson 474.* W 3.

This is described in detail by Keith in the *Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library*, vol. ii, p. 107. His description may be supplemented by the following:

Peculiarity of spelling: ए is occasionally written as ।/, e.g. f. 2 r. line 2: ईशे = ईाश; ऋते = ऋात; पवते = पवात; f. 2 r., line 3; इंद्रेण° = इंाद्रण; वेविषाणा = ावविषाणा.

ऐ is written as ।/ए, e.g. इंद्रेयैते = इंाद्रायैते.

ओ " " " ।/।, " इंद्रो = इंाद्रा; तुत्सवो = तुत्सावा.

But its chief peculiarity is that it frequently doubles consonants in conjunction, e.g. f. 2 r., line 2: पृथिव्व्या, व् is doubled, इन्नद्रम्, न् is doubled; तुत्त्सावा, त् is doubled; line 4: किञ्ञ्न, ञ् is doubled; line 5: वीर्य्याणि, य् is doubled; प्प्रवोचम्, प् is doubled; line 6: प्प्रत्यच्च° for प्रत्यच°; line 7: सर्व्व, व् is doubled; f. 2 v., line 2: चिद्न्यद्विद्विशंसत for चिद्न्यद्विशंसत, f. 3 r., line 1: चक्षपञ्च, क् is doubled; line 6: बहुलम्, ह् is doubled, याम्मेषु, म is doubled; f. 4 r., line 1: ामाजास्वदम्मपुष्कारिणीवावरमेति for मोजसेदम्पुष्कारिणीव वेरमेति, and so on.

MS. *Mill 144.* Mi.

Copied at Ahmedabad, A.D. 1730.

This is described in detail by Keith in the *Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library*, vol. ii, p. 106. It occasionally doubles त् in conjunction with other consonants, e.g. f. 2 r., line 8: प्रतिषेधत्यत्सीत्युत्पन्नस्य &c.

The numbering of sections does not begin anew in each *pāda*, but is continuous, and agrees with the longer recension as to the total number of sections in Chapters IX–XII. It belongs to the shorter recension.

MS. *Sanskrit, e. 17.* S.

A.D. 1781.

This is described in detail by Keith in the *Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library*, vol. ii, p. 105. The text is punctuated as usual, and divided into chapters and sections. A summary similar to the one described on p. 1 is added at the end of each chapter. It belongs to the longer recension. The text is bounded on both sides by two sets of double red lines. It is a neat and accurate manuscript.

The Relationship of the MSS.: two recensions.

The manuscripts fall into two groups, and for the sake of convenience and brevity, may be called A and B—A representing the longer and B the shorter recension. None of the manuscripts grouped in these two families is earlier than A.D. 1479. Although they have been copied from earlier manuscripts—often with great labour and trouble as some of the scribes remark—neither of them transmits the text of the *Nirukta* in an uninterpolated state. Both recensions add the *pariśiṣṭa*—which can be proved to be an interpolation by independent testimony—as an integral part of the text, and cannot, therefore, be the faithful representatives of the archetype. Moreover, both have besides the *pariśiṣṭa*, an entire section or the equivalent of a section added on to them. These additions are meaningless. The commentary on the Vedic stanzas quoted therein is very poor, and written in a style quite different from that of Yāska. For instance, there can hardly be any doubt as to the interpolated character of ix. 2, which is given as a constituent part of the text by the manuscripts of both recensions. Further, the commentary on the Vedic stanza in xi. 7 is meaningless and written in a different style. The Vedic stanza, being quite easy, requires no explanation. Yāska generally does not comment on easy Vedic stanzas, simply remarking: *iti sā nigada-vyākhyātā*[1], i.e. 'this stanza is explained by the mere reading'. In all such cases, this note of Yāska comes after easy Vedic stanzas only. It would thus be intelligible, if it had followed immediately the Vedic stanzas in xi. 7. But as the text now stands, it is placed just after a very difficult Vedic stanza in xi. 8. This is contrary to Yāska's method. It is clear that the words: *iti sā nigada-vyākhyātā* were originally placed immediately after the Vedic stanzas in xi. 7. The intervening passage is an interpolation, and rather a clumsy one, for it can be easily detected. This is further proved by the fact that Durga, who repeats every word of Yāska in his commentary, ignores them. How these additions gradually find their way into the text is illustrated by the following example. There is an easy quotation in xii. 2, and Yāska, as usual, simply adds: *iti sā nigada-vyākhyātā*. Some interpolators have endeavoured to add after these words a short comment. Thus some manuscripts here subjoin the following remark: वसातिषु स्म चरथो वसातयो रातयो वसक्ते ..... सुरातयोः ॥

Further, each recension contains passages, which, being superfluous, are omitted by the other, or are amplified versions of those in the other. For example, B adds, between vii. 19 and 20, one entire section, which is omitted by A. It is clearly an interpolation as the commentary on the Vedic stanzas is identical with that of xiv. 33 with slight alterations.

[1] Cf. N. x. 18, 24; xi. 3, 45; xii. 31.

Again, in B the commentary on the Vedic stanza quoted in v. 27, reads as follows: सुदेवस्त्वं कल्याणदानो यस्य तव देव सप्त सिंधवः प्राणायानुक्षरन्ति काकुदं सूर्म्यं सुषिरामिवेत्यपि निगमो भवति ॥२७॥

A's version of this is greatly amplified:

सुदेवस्त्वं कल्याणदेवः कमनीयदेवो वा भवसि वरुण यस्य ते सप्त सिंधवः सिन्धु स्रवणाद्यस्य ते सप्त स्रोतांसि तानि ते काकुदमनुक्षरन्ति । सूर्मिः कल्याणोर्मिः स्रोतः सुषिरमनु यथा । वीरिटं तैटीकिरन्तरिक्षमेवमाह पूर्वं वयतेरुत्तरमिरतेर्वयांसीरन्त्य-स्मिन्भांसि वा । तदेतस्यामृच्युदाहरणमपि निगमो भवति ॥२७॥

Further, A contains a long passage in 6.5: इन्द्र ऋषीन्पप्रच्छ .... व्याख्याताः omitted by B.

d. 'Omissio ex homoeoteleuto' in Sanskrit Manuscripts.

It is clear, therefore, that both the recensions cannot faithfully represent the archetype. Hence the question arises which of them adheres more closely to the original? Roth adopted the text as given by the longer recension in his edition, without, however, assigning adequate reasons for his preference. The same text is also adopted by most of the editors of the *Nirukta*. This text, as has been shown above, does not represent the original. It is true that often the longer recension preserves the better text, for sometimes passages are omitted by accident. The eye of the scribe wanders from a particular word to the same or to a similar word, occurring further on in the text, with the result that the intervening words are omitted. This phenomenon known as *omissio ex homoeoteleuto* is universal and of very frequent occurrence. The following example illustrates this kind of omission. In copying the lines: 'The book, which is rather scarce, was till very lately of absolute necessity for the Student of the Christian hymnology, above all for the Student of Adam of St. Victor's hymns',[1] the eye of the copyist wandered from the student of the first to the same word in the second line and the words 'of the Christian .... for the' were left out. The same thing happened to the scribe of MS. C 3. In copying the sentence: सोऽदेवानसृजत तत्सुराणां सुरत्वम् । असोरसुरान-सृजत तदसुराणामसुरत्वमिति विज्ञायते his eye wandered from the word असृजत in the first line to the same word in the second line, with the result that the words तत्सुराणां सुरत्वम् । असोरसुरान् were left out.

Again, in copying N. vi. 22: स्थूरं राधः शताश्वं कुरुङ्गस्य दिविष्टिषु । RV. VIII. 4. 19. स्थूरः समाश्रितमात्रो महान्भवति । the eye of the scribe wandered from the स्थूरं of the first line to the similar word स्थूरः in the second line,

[1] Clark, *Descent of Manuscripts*, p. 1.

consequently the intervening words राधः शताश्वं . . . . दिविष्टिषु were omitted in MS. C 3.

Further in N. ii. 26: देवोऽनयत्सविता सुपाणिः कल्याणपाणिः। पाणिः पणायतेः पूजाकर्मणः प्रगृह्य पाणी देवान्पूजयन्ति। तस्य वयं प्रसवे याम उर्वीः। देवोऽनयत्सविता सुपाणिः is the first *pāda* of the second hemistich of the stanza of RV. III. 33. 6. Unconsciously the scribe remembered the second *pāda* तस्य वयं प्रसवे याम उर्वीः and wrote it down immediately after finishing the first *pāda* with the result that the intervening words कल्याणपाणिः। पाणिः पणायते . . . . पूजयन्ति are missing in MS. C 4. It cannot therefore be concluded that the shorter recension is always the best, for sometimes omissions are accidental.

e. Dittography in Sanskrit Manuscripts.

On the other hand, there is also the phenomenon called dittography, i. e. the repetition or addition of a few words or sentences. An excellent example of dittography is furnished by *The Globe* on July 9, 1915.

'The *Echo de Paris* publishes a message from Cettinje announcing the message from Cettinje announcing the appointment as Governor of Scutari of Bojo Petrovitch.'[1] The part of the second line is a verbatim repetition of a part of the first line.

In N. ii. 28, उत स्म वाजी क्षिपणिं तुरण्यति ग्रीवायां बद्धो अपि . . . . क्रतुं दधिक्राः . . . .

अपिकक्ष आसनीति व्याख्यातम्। क्रतुं वाजी क्षिपणिं तुरण्यति ग्रीवायां बद्धो दधिक्राः . . . . the eye of the scribe wandered by chance after क्रतुं to the Vedic stanza, and he mechanically copies the whole of the first line except उत स्म in MS. C 5.

Again, in N. vi. 8, the scribe of the MS. Mi. repeats गृह्णातिकर्मा वा.

Further there are some passages whose omission by B is absolutely unjustifiable. Yāska explains every word occurring in the fourth chapter of the *Nighaṇṭu*. The omission of the passages containing the explanation of any of these words is therefore inconsistent with Yāska's plan. Examples of such omissions are the following. Yāska explains निशृंभाः (*Ngh.* 4. 3. 12) in N. vi. 3, but the passage: निशृंभा निश्रथ्यहारिणः is omitted by B. Again, Yāska explains चोणस्य (*Ngh.* 4. 3. 28) in N. vi. 6 as चोणस्य चयणस्य, which is omitted by B. This omission makes the following Vedic quotation meaningless.

Further, in commenting upon a Vedic stanza, Yāska always starts from the very beginning of the stanza. To leave out the first few words and to

[1] Clark, *op. cit.*, p. 6.

begin from somewhere in the middle of the stanza is altogether foreign to his practice, yet if the text of B be followed, the omission of the passage: यवमिव वृकेणाश्विनौ निवपन्तौ (N. vi. 26) would involve Yāska in an inconsistency. All this shows that B is not absolutely reliable.

Now let us examine A. The majority of the manuscripts of A belong to a period later than those of B. Thus, not one of them has preserved the old spelling, while most of the B MSS. retain this peculiarity, i.e.

of writing	ए	as	।/	as वार्ष	for	वर्षे
,,	ऐ	,,	।/ए	,, ।वेश्य	,,	वैश्य
,,	ओ	,,	।/।	,, चाया	,,	चयो
,,	ळ्ह	for	ढ	,, वोळ्हारः	,,	वोढारः

Again, some of the A MSS. divide the *pariśiṣṭa* into the so-called thirteenth and the fourteenth chapters, while those of B put the whole of the *pariśiṣṭa* into one chapter only, which is numbered the thirteenth.

It has already been pointed out that A contains an obvious interpolation in N. vi. 5, and an amplified version of B's comment in N. v. 27. Besides these there are shorter passages scattered throughout the book which are omitted by B and are suspected to be interpolations. One very fertile and insidious source of interpolations is supplied by Yāska's own method of giving etymological explanations. He does not content himself with one derivation, but goes on adding derivation after derivation of a single word till the whole list of probable, possible, and even fanciful etymologies is exhausted. In many cases, interpolators found it quite easy to add new derivations and attribute them to Yāska. A contains a considerable number of such additions, while B has only two.

The following are a few samples:

N. ii. 6. A reads: वृक्षो व्रश्चनात्। वृत्वा क्षां तिष्ठतीति वा। क्षा क्षियतेर्निवासकर्मणः। नियतामीमयत् . . . .

B reads: वृक्षो व्रश्चनात्। नियतामीमयत् . . . .

The two derivations are omitted.

N. ii. 10. A reads: हिरण्यं कस्मात् . . . . हितरमणं भवतीति वा हृदयरमणं भवतीति वा।

B reads: हिरण्यं कस्मात् . . . . . हितरमणं भवतीति वा।

N. ii. 13. A reads: सूर्यमादित्यमदितेः पुत्रमेवम्।

B reads: सूर्यमादित्यमेवम्।

N. ii. 20. A reads: आमिनाने आमिन्वाने अन्योन्यस्याध्यात्मं कुर्वाणे।

B reads: आमिनाने अन्योन्यस्याध्यात्मं कुर्वाणे।

N. ii. 22. A reads: प्रथम इति मुख्यनाम प्रतमो भवति । छन्तममन्तरिक्षम् । विकर्तनं मेघानां विकर्तनेन मेघानामुदकं जायते ।

B reads: प्रथम इति मुख्यनाम प्रतमो भवति । विकर्तनेन मेघानामुदकं जायते ।

N. iii. 8. A reads: अग्रगामिन्यो भवन्तीति वाग्रगालिन्यो भवन्तीति वाग्रकारिण्यो भवन्तीति वाग्रसारिण्यो भवन्तीति वाङ्गना भवन्ति ....

B reads: अग्रगामिन्यो भवन्तीति वाग्रगालिन्यो भवन्तीति वाग्रकारिण्यो भवन्तीति वाङ्गना भवन्ति ....

N. iii. 10. A reads: आखण्डयितः । खण्डं खण्डयतेः तडिदित्यन्तिकवधयोः ....

B reads: आखण्डयितः । तडिदित्यन्तिकवधयोः ....

N. iii. 15. A reads: को वां शयने विधवेव देवरम् । देवरं कस्माद् द्वितीयो वर उच्यते । विधवा विधातृका भवति ।

B reads: को वां शयने विधवेव देवरम् । विधवा विधातृका भवति । In this particular case it is obvious that the passage देवरं कस्मात्, &c., is an interpolation, for as the words stand in the first line, Yāska would naturally give the etymological explanation of विधवा first and then of देवर, not vice versā. As a matter of fact he does so; after explaining विधवा he says: देवरो दीव्यतिकर्मा. This would have been absurd if the reading of A represents the original.

N. iii. 16. A reads: ब्राह्मणा इव वृषला इवेति । वृषलो वृषशीलो भवति वृषाशीलो वा ॥१६॥

B reads: ब्राह्मणा इव वृषला इवेति ॥१६॥

N. iii. 19. A reads: निर्णीतान्तर्हित .... षट् । निर्णीतं कस्मात् । निर्णिक्तं भवति ।

B reads: निर्णीतान्तर्हित .... षट् ।

N. iv. 2. A reads: मर्यादा .... स्यात् । मर्यादा मर्यैरादीयते । मर्यादा मर्यादिनो र्विभागः ।

B reads: मर्यादा .... स्यात् । मर्यादा मर्यादिनो र्विभागः ।

N. iv. 10. A reads: लक्ष्मी र्लाभाद्वा लक्षणाद्वा लप्स्यनाद्वा लाञ्छनाद्वा ...

B reads: लक्ष्मी र्लाभाद्वा लक्षणाद्वा लाञ्छनाद्वा ...

N. iv. 13. A reads: ईर्मान्ताः समीरितान्ताः सुसमीरितान्ताः पृथ्वन्ता वा ।

B reads: ईर्मान्ताः समीरितान्ताः पृथ्वन्ता वा ।

N. iv. 15. A reads: कन्या कमनीया भवति । क्वेयं नेतव्येति वा । कमनेनानीयत इति वा । कनति र्वा ।

B reads: कन्या कमनीया भवति । क्वेयं नेतव्येति वा । कनतेर्वा ।

N. iv. 19. A reads: उदकं हर उच्यते। लोका हरांस्युच्यन्ते। असृगहनी हरसी उच्येते।

B reads: उदकं हर उच्यते। लोका हरांस्युच्यन्ते।

N. v. 3. A reads: पानैरिति वा स्वाशनैरिति वा स्पर्शनैरिति वा।

B reads: पानैरिति वा स्वाशनैरिति वा।

N. v. 12. A reads: तुग्रप्रहारी क्षिप्रप्रहारी उग्रप्रहारी।

B reads: तुग्रप्रहारी।

N. v. 26. A reads: जिह्वा कोकुवा। कोकूयमाना वर्णान्नुदतीति वा। कोकूयतेर्वा स्याच्छब्दकर्मणः।

B reads: जिह्वा कोकुवा। कोकूयमाना वर्णान्नुदतीति वा।

N. vi. 8. A reads: जिगर्ति गिरतिकर्मा वा गृणातिकर्मा वा गृह्णातिकर्मा वा।

B reads: जिगर्ति गिरतिकर्मा वा गृह्णातिकर्मा वा

N. vi. 16. A reads: अभवत सर्वेऽग्रगमनेनेति वाग्रगरणेनेति वाग्रसंपादिन इति वा।

B reads: अभवत सर्वेऽग्रगमनेनेति वाग्रसंपादिन इति वा।

N. vi. 33. A reads: शीर्यते बिठे। बिठमन्तरिक्षम्। बिठं बीरिटेन व्याख्यातम्।

B reads: शीर्यते बिठे। बिठं बीरिटेन व्याख्यातम्।

N. vi. 32. A reads: बुन्द इषुर्भवति बिन्दो वा भिन्दो वा भयदो वा . . .

B reads: बुन्द इषुर्भवति भिन्दो वा भयदो वा . . .

N. vi. 33. A reads: ऋदूपे अर्दनपातिनौ गमनपातिनौ शब्दपातिनौ दूरपातिनौ वा मर्मण्यर्दनवेधिनौ गमनवेधिनौ शब्दवेधिनौ दूरवेधिनौ वा।

B reads: ऋदूपे अर्दनपातिनौ गमनपातिनौ वा मर्मण्यर्दनवेधिनौ गमनवेधिनौ वा।

Instances might be multiplied, but the above examples suffice to show that A has been much more tampered with than B.

Fortunately, as has been said above, Durga repeats every word of the *Nirukta* in his commentary, so that the text of the *Nirukta* 'in toto' can be reproduced from his commentary alone. This commentary therefore serves the purpose of a manuscript of the *Nirukta* and supplies valuable information about the condition of the text in its author's time. Durga does not recognize the *pariśiṣṭa* as an integral part of the *Nirukta*, as in fact he is even unaware of its existence. Thus his commentary preserves the text of the *Nirukta* as current before the addition of the *pariśiṣṭa*. Further, it derives great value from the fact that Durga displays critical judgement in the adoption of readings in the text, while giving variants and adding critical notes on them. For example, in N. i. 2, he reads अयुगपत् but

gives युगपत् as a variant, adding: युगपदुत्पन्नानामयुगपदुत्पन्नानामित्युभावपि पाठौ व्याहारं प्राप्तुतः।

Again, in N. i. 12, he reads संविज्ञातानि but gives संविज्ञानानि as a variant, adding अथवा संविज्ञानानि तानि संविज्ञातानि तानि चेत्युभावप्येतौ पाठौ।

Again, in N. iii. 15, he remarks: अपि न य इत्यस्य निघण्टुसूक्तस्य दुर्मदासो न सुरायामित्यनेनैव गतार्थतेति मन्यमानाः केचिदत्र निगमं नाधीयते। अपरे पुनः समाम्नायानुक्रमोऽयमिति मन्यमाना एवमेवं निगममधीयते।

Again, in N. iii. 21, he reads अविनाशि but gives अविनाश as a variant, adding: अन्ये त्वधीयते अविनाश नामेति। तेषामविनाशस्यैव नाम।

Again, in N. iv. 19, he reads स्नुः but gives असन् as a variant, adding: भाष्येऽपि स्नुरित्येषः पाठः। (*sic*) असनित्येषः प्रमादपाठः।

Again, in N. vi. 2, he remarks: निरजे गा इत्यत्र केचित्पशुगव्य एता इति व्याचक्षते।

Again, in N. vi. 4, he reads अवनायान्नम् but gives अवनेनान्नम् and अनेनान्नम् as variants.

Again, in N. vi. 6, he reads अयणस्य but gives वीणस्य as a variant, adding: वीणस्येत्येवमेके मन्यन्ते। तत्पुनरनुपपन्नम्। अयणस्येति हि भाष्यकारो निराह।

Again, on N. vi. 21, he remarks: ऋञ्जतिः प्रसाधनकर्मा। मा त्वावीक इत्यनेन गतार्थतामस्य मन्यमानो भाष्यकारो निगमं नाधीते। केचित्त्वेतं शेषमधीयते। दूतं वो विश्ववेदसं .... 3. 5. 8. 1.

Again, on N. vi. 33, he remarks: भाष्यमत्र न सम्यगिव लक्ष्यते। तस्य सम्यक् पाठोऽन्वेष्यः। ततो योज्यम्।

This shows that Durga took pains to ascertain the correct readings and has handed down a sort of critical edition of the *Nirukta*, as it existed in his time.

f. 1. Three stages of interpolations.

We have thus manuscript materials which belong to three distinct periods.

(1) D, i.e. the commentary of Durga, written before the edition of the *pariśiṣṭas* and embodying the whole text of the *Nirukta*, represents the earliest period, i.e. about the thirteenth century A.D.

(2) B, i.e. the manuscripts of the shorter recension represent a period later than D,—when the *pariśiṣṭas* were added, but not divided as yet into different chapters, and when the old orthography was still prevalent.

(3) A, i.e. the manuscript of the longer recension, represents a still later period when the *pariśiṣṭas* had been divided into chapters and the old orthography had gone out of use.

A collation of these three different recensions indicates that three distinct stages of interpolations in the *Nirukta* can be clearly traced. For example, let us take a passage in N. i. 4. On collating D, B, and A, we find that the reading of D has been expanded in B, and that of B in A.

N. i. 4. D reads: आचार्यश्चिदिदं ब्रूयादिति पूजायाम्। दधिचिदित्युपमार्थे। कुल्माषांश्चिदाहरेत्यवकुत्सिते। नु इत्येषो . . . .

B reads: आचार्यश्चिदिदं ब्रूयादिति पूजायाम्। आचार्य आचारं ग्राहयत्याचिनोत्यर्थानाचिनोति बुद्धिमिति वा। दधिचिदित्युपमार्थे। कुल्माषांश्चिदाहरेत्यवकुत्सिते। कुल्माषाः कुलेषु सीदन्ति। नु इत्येषो . . . .

A reads: आचार्यश्चिदिदं ब्रूयादिति पूजायाम्। आचार्यः कस्मात्। आचार्य आचारं ग्राहयत्याचिनोत्यर्थानाचिनोति बुद्धिमिति वा। दधिचिदित्युपमार्थे। कुल्माषांश्चिदाहरेत्यवकुत्सिते। कुल्माषाः कुलेषु सीदन्ति। नु इत्येषो . . . .

Another example for these three stages is suppled by N. ix. 2, as follows:

D reads:

अश्वो व्याख्यातः। तस्यैषा भवति ॥१॥

मा नो मित्रो वरुणो अर्यमायुरिन्द्र . . . .

B reads:

अश्वो व्याख्यातः। तस्यैषा भवति ॥१॥

अश्वो वोळ्हा सुखं . . . . . . इन्द्रायेन्दो परि स्रव ॥

अश्वो वोळ्हा सुखं वोळ्हा। सुखमिति कल्याणनाम। कल्याणं पुण्यं सुहितं भवति। माणो व्याख्यातः। तस्यैषा भवति ॥२॥

मा नो मित्रो वरुणो अर्यमायुरिन्द्र . . . .

A reads:

अश्वो व्याख्यातः। तस्यैषा भवति ॥१॥

अश्वो वोळ्हा सुखं . . . . . इन्द्रायेन्दो परि स्रव ॥

अश्वो वोळ्हा सुखं वोळ्हा रथं वोळ्हा। सुखमिति कल्याणनाम। कल्याणं पुण्यं सुहितं भवति। सुहितं मम्यतीति वा। हसिता वा पाता वा पालयिता वा। ग्रैपमृच्छतीति। वारि वारयति। माणो व्याख्यातः। तस्यैषा भवति ॥२॥

मा नो मित्रो वरुण अर्यमायुरिन्द्र . . . .

It has been shown above that the list of etymologies increases as one passes from the text of B to that of A. In the same manner the list of etymologies increases in B as compared with D. The following are some examples.

N. i. 4. D reads: कुल्माषांश्चिदाहरेत्यवकुत्सिते। नु इत्येषो: . . . .

B reads: कुल्माषांश्चिदाहरेत्यवकुत्सिते। कुल्माषाः कुलेषु सीदन्ति। नु इत्ये-षो . . . .

D reads: वयाः शाखा वेतेः। शाखाः खशयाः।

B reads: वयाः शाखा वेतेर्वातायना भवन्ति। शाखाः खशयाः शक्नोतेर्वा।

N. i. 7. D reads: बृहद्वदेम स्वे वेदने। बृहदिति महतो नामधेयम्।

B reads: बृहद्वदेम स्वे वेदने। भगो भजतेः। बृहदिति महतोनामधेयम्।

N. ii. 22. D reads: वृबूकमित्युदकनाम . . . शब्दकर्मणो भ्रंशतेर्वा ॥२२॥

B reads: वृबूकमित्युदकनाम . . . . शब्दकर्मणो भ्रंशतेर्वा। पुरीषं पृणातेः पूरयतेर्वा ॥२२॥

N. ii. 26. D reads:

तस्य वयं प्रसवे याम उर्वीः।
प्रत्याख्यायान्तत आमुश्रुवः ॥२६॥

B reads:

तस्य वयं प्रसवे याम उर्वीः।
उर्व्य ऊर्णोति वृणोतेरित्यौर्णवाभः।
प्रत्याख्यायान्तत आमुश्रुवः ॥२६॥

N. iii. 18. D reads: सिंहः सहनात्। संपूर्वस्य वा हन्तेः संहाय हन्तीति वा।

B reads: सिंहः सहनात्। हिंसेर्वा स्याद् विपरीतस्यः। संपूर्वस्य वा हन्तेः संहाय हन्तीति वा।

N. v. 4. D reads: शर्या अङ्गुलयो भवन्ति। शर्या इषवः शरमय्यः।

B reads: शर्या अङ्गुलयो भवन्ति। सृजन्ति कर्माणि। शर्या इषवः शरमय्यः।

N. v. 23. D reads:

उदच्यायो अधायतः समस्मात्।
इति पंचम्याम् ॥२३॥

B reads:

उदच्यायो अधायतः समस्मात्।
इति पंचम्याम्। उदच्यतिरकर्मकः।
अथापि प्रथमाबहुवचने।
नभन्तामन्यके समे ॥२३॥

MS. C 1 agrees with B except that the last line **गमन्तामन्वके समे** is omitted.

N. vi. 3. D reads:

उद्धर रक्षः सहमूलमिन्द्र ।
वृश्चमध्यम् । प्रतिशृणीह्यग्रम् ।

B reads:

उद्धर रक्षः सहमूलमिन्द्र ।
मूलं मोचनाद्वा मोषणाद्वा मोहनाद्वा ।
वृश्चमध्यम् । प्रतिशृणीह्यग्रम् ।

N. vi. 8. D reads: **देवो देवान्प्रत्यक्तया कृपा कल्पितया ॥ ८॥**

B reads: **देवो देवान्प्रत्यक्तया कृपा । कृपा कृपुतेर्वा कल्पतेर्वा ॥ ८॥**

N. vi. 24. D reads: **गल्दा धमनयो भवन्ति ।**

A reads: **गल्दा धमनयो भवन्ति । गलनमासु धीयते ।**

B omits it altogether.

N. vi. 28. D reads: **चन्वा किल .... कक्षेव युक्तं लिबुजेव वृषम् ।**

B reads: **चन्वा किल .... कक्षेव युक्तं लिबुजेव वृषम् । लिबुजा व्रततिर्भवति लीयते विभजन्तीति । व्रततिर्वरणाच्च सयनाच्च ततनाच्च ।**

f. 2. **Parallel instance of Servius, commentator of Virgil.**

Thus the stages of interpolation at different periods can be traced. The principle of the 'best MSS.' is obviously inapplicable in this case, for none of the manuscripts can be called the best. All that is available is the best manuscript of each family, and the best plan, under the circumstances, would be to place all the three families side by side. Fortunately it is possible to do so, for the successive interpolations from one family to another are invariably the amplifications of the text of a shorter recension, and are thrust between sentences wherever the text could be so enlarged with impunity, as, for instance, in multiplying the number of etymologies and attributing them all to Yāska. I have, however, distinguished the evidence of Durga's commentary from that of the manuscripts of the *Nirukta*, although Durga's commentary is very important for supplying such valuable evidence for the history of the text of the *Nirukta*, it cannot, strictly speaking, be called a manuscript of the *Nirukta*. The relation of the shorter to the longer recension is shown by the use of square brackets, which contain the additional passages of the longer recension, while the relation of the shorter recension to the text preserved by Durga is indicated by foot-notes. An analogous example is furnished by Latin literature. The text of Servius, commentator of Virgil, shows a similar threefold amplifica-

tion, the three stages of interpolation being pointed out by Thilo in his edition. I think the text of the *Nirukta* reproduced from Durga represents the archetype as closely as it is possible to restore it with the help of the present materials. I have collated[1] sixteen manuscripts myself, besides taking into account fourteen manuscripts collated by Roth, and eight by the editor of the *Nirukta* in Bib. Ind. Thus, directly and indirectly, the evidence of about forty manuscripts has been available for this edition, and the text may therefore be regarded as more or less settled.

g. Commentators of Yāska.

Although, from an early period, Yāska's work has been recognized as one of the most important *vedāṅgas* by the orthodox tradition of literary India, he, unlike Pāṇini, has not had many commentators. This does not mean that he had few followers or that his speculations did not dominate the thought of succeeding generations. On the contrary, he has been acknowledged to be the pre-eminent authority on etymology. Hence (at first sight) it seems rather inexplicable that his work should have been commented upon by so few people. One reason of this paucity is that Yāska's work itself is a commentary and not an independent treatise, hence it did not stand in need of much elucidation. Secondly, it is written in classical Sanskrit prose, and, notwithstanding its somewhat archaic and terse style, is easily intelligible to the reader as compared, for instance, with the aphorisms of Pāṇini; consequently there was not much demand for further comment. Yet three commentators, at least, are known to have elucidated Yāska's work.

(1) Ugra is mentioned as a commentator on the *Nirukta* by Aufrecht in his *Catalogus Catalogorum*.[2] But no other information, about his personality, the character of his work, and the time when he lived, is available. No reference is made to him by any of the other writers in the same field.

(2) The second commentator is Skandasvāmi, mentioned by Devarājayajvan.[3] A manuscript of his work exists in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris,[4] and a friend of mine from Lahore has recently informed me that he has obtained a complete manuscript of his commentary.

[1] Since then, on my visit to Paris, I have been able, through the courtesy of Professor Sylvain Lévi, to examine the *Nirukta* manuscripts in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Nos. 257–64, described by Cabaton in the *Catalogue sommaire des Manuscrits Sanskrits et Pāli*, pp. 39–40. All of them, except the first collated by Roth, belong to the nineteenth century. They all represent the text of the longer recension, and do not afford any other variants. The contents of Nos. 263 and 264 is Durga's commentary, which comes to an end with the twelfth chapter.

[2] Vol. i, p. 297.

[3] See Bib. Ind. ed., vol. i, pp. 2–4.

[4] *Loc. cit.* (Aufrecht).

(3) But the most important of all these commentators is Durga. He seems to be later than Devarājayajvan who is familiar with the then extant commentaries on the Vedas, the *Nighaṇṭu*, and the *Nirukta*, and who does not mention Durga in the long list of the authorities used by him for the purpose of his own work. Although a conclusion based on the argument of silence is not cogent, yet in this particular case, it is justified to assume that Durga is not referred to because he was posterior to Devarāja, hence Durga would also be later than Skandasvāmī. Durga's commentary is published, and has superseded the works of his predecessors. His work is important for two reasons: (1) he is the last of the commentators, and therefore represents the fullest development of the traditional interpretation of the *Nirukta*; (2) the very fact that it has survived at the cost of earlier commentaries indicates its importance. We shall therefore examine his work somewhat in detail.

Date of Durga.

It has already been pointed out that in all probability he is later than Devarājayajvan, though this assumption hardly helps us, for the date of Devarāja himself is not known. However, Durga's lower limit can be determined almost with certainty. A manuscript[1] of his commentary in the Bodleian Library is dated 1387 A.D. The date is genuine and is accepted as such by Professor A. B. Keith.[2] The manuscript was copied at Bhṛgu Kṣetra in the reign of Mahārāṇā—Durgasiṁhavijaya. Thus he could not be later than 1387 A.D. It is difficult to identify any particular site with Bhṛgu Kṣetra, but probably it was situated somewhere between the Sarasvatī and the Jamnā. As Durga wrote his commentary in a hermitage near Jammu, a place not easily accessible in the absence of modern means of communication, the migration of the MS. of his commentary to Bhṛgu Kṣetra presupposes the lapse of sufficient time in order to account for the spreading of his fame as a commentator from the isolated heights of Jammu to the plains of Bhṛgu Kṣetra. It will not be far from the truth, therefore, to place Durga about the thirteenth century A.D.

Durga does not speak of any predecessors by name nor does he leave any clue as to the sources of his own commentary. Unlike Devarājayajvan, he does not give the slightest information about himself or the general state of the *Nirukta* during his time. That he wrote his commentary in a hermitage near Jammu is proved by the colophon[3] on f. 132 v. at the end of the eleventh chapter of the *Nirukta*, which runs as follows:

[1] MS. Wilson 475.

[2] See *Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library*, vol. ii, p. 108.

[3] MS. Wilson 475.

ऋज्वर्थायां निरुक्तवृत्तौ जम्बूमार्गाश्रमनिवासिन आचार्यभगवद्दुर्गसिंहकृतौ षोडशस्याध्यायस्य चतुर्थः पादः समाप्तः। This shows that the full name of the commentator was Durgasiṁha. The fact that he lived in a hermitage and was addressed as *bhagavat* indicates that he was an ascetic and belonged to some particular order of Sannyāsa. Further, he is a descendant of the family of the Vasiṣṭhas. He does not explain the stanza RV. III. 53. 23, quoted [1] by Yāska to illustrate the meaning of the word *lodham*, because the stanza implies hostility to Vasiṣṭha. He says: यस्मिन्निगम एष शब्दः सा वसिष्ठद्वेषिणी ऋक्। अहं च कापिष्ठलो वासिष्ठः। अतस्तां न निर्ब्रवीमि। 'The stanza, in which this word (*lodham*) occurs is hostile to Vasiṣṭha. And I am a descendant of Vasiṣṭha, belonging to the Kapiṣṭhala branch, hence I do not explain the stanza.' [2]

Sāyaṇa has the following note on it: पुरा खलु विश्वामित्रशिष्यः सुदानाम राजर्षिरासीत्। स च केनचित् कारणेन वसिष्ठद्वेष्योऽभूत्। विश्वामित्रस्तु शिष्यस्य रक्षार्थमाभिर्ऋग्भिर्वसिष्ठमशपत्। इमा अभिशापरूपाः। ता ऋचो वसिष्ठा न शृण्वन्ति।

'There was formerly a royal sage named Sudās, a disciple of Viśvāmitra. Somehow, he became an object of Vasiṣṭha's hatred. Then, Viśvāmitra, in order to protect his disciple, reviled Vasiṣṭha with these stanzas. These are the imprecatory stanzas. The Vasiṣṭhas do not pay any attention (lit. listen) to them.' [3] This corroborates Yāska's statement that there are stanzas which contain asseveration and imprecation only.[4]

Durga's commentary is important for it repeats every word of Yāska, thus the text of the *Nirukta* 'in toto' could be reproduced from Durga's work alone. As none of the manuscripts collated by me is older than the fifteenth century, Durga supplies therefore evidence of a very valuable character for the textual criticism of the *Nirukta*. The number of variants attributed by Durga to his predecessors and his frequent remarks that the text is corrupt and that the right reading is to be discovered,—all such cases I have pointed out in my notes,—indicate that there has been no unbroken tradition with regard to the handing down of the text of the *Nirukta*.

Further there seems to have been some sort of revival of the study of the *Nirukta* in the neighbourhood of Jammu in Durga's time, for it seems difficult to imagine that in an isolated place like Jammu, Durga sat down to write his commentary simply for the love of writing a commentary. It is more reasonable to suppose that Durga accomplished this task in order

[1] The *Nirukta*, iv. 14.
[2] Durga's Commentary on the N. iv. 14.
[3] Sāyaṇa on RV. III. 53. Cf. Bib. Ind. edition of the *Nirukta*, vol. ii, p. 416. Cf. Muir, *Sanskrit Texts*.
[4] N. vii. 3.

to meet the demand for a good text, elucidation of obscure passages, and amplification of Yāska's arguments, a demand which a revival of the study of the *Nirukta* had called forth. The examination of the manuscript of Durga's commentary, mentioned above, leads one to the conclusion that Durga did not live to complete his work and that he himself wrote his commentary up to the end of the 11th chapter only. This is indicated by a comparison of colophons in the manuscript which, at the end of the 7th–12th chapters, numbered as 12–17 by Durga consecutively from the five chapters of the *Nighaṇṭu*, are as follows:

(1) At the end of the 7th chap. on f. 50 r. ॥ द्वादशोऽध्यायः ॥
(2) „ „ 8th chap. on f. 70 v. ॥ इति निरुक्तवृत्तौ त्रयो . . . ध्यायः ॥
(3) „ „ 9th chap. on f. 86 v. ॥ ऋज्वर्थायां निरु . . . समाप्तः ॥
(4) „ „ 10th chap. on f. 112 r. ॥ ऋज्व . . . पंचदशोऽध्यायः समाप्तः ॥
(5) „ „ 11th chap. on f. 132 v. ॥ ऋज्वर्थायां निरुक्तवृत्तौ जंबूमार्गाश्रमनिवासिन आचार्यभगवद्दुर्गसिंहकृतौ षोडशस्याध्यायस्य चतुर्थः पादः समाप्तः ॥

A comparison of these five colophons shows that the first four do not contain any reference to Durga by name nor to his honorific titles, which fact implies that they were written by Durga himself, while that at the end of the 11th chapter was added by some disciple, who speaks of Durga as an *ācārya* and addresses him as *bhagavat*. Durga could not have appropriated these titles himself unless he was very vain. Another point in favour of the fifth colophon being written by a person other than Durga is that while the first four colophons say that such and such a chapter has come to an end, the fifth remarks that such a *pāda* of that chapter has come to an end. The colophon at the end of the 11th chapter is the final inscription and as such should have been placed at the end of the 12th chapter, where no such description is found; the colophon there, on f. 150 r., being ॥ सप्तदशस्य चतुर्थः पादः ॥ This leads one to the conclusion that Durga himself wrote his commentary up to the end of the 11th chapter, whose colophon was added by a disciple who also wrote the commentary on the 12th chapter, and faithfully refrained himself from adding the name of Durga in the colophon at the end of the 12th chapter. MS. Mill 142, dated A.D. 1839, and described in the *Catalogues of Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library* by Keith,[1] also preserves the final inscription at the end of the 11th chapter, while on f. 123 v., at the end of the 12th chapter it simply says ॥ सप्तदशस्य चतुर्थः पादः ॥ It is also to be noticed that in this manuscript

[1] Vol. ii, p. 108.

as well, the word *adhyāya* only is used in the earlier colophons while *pāda* makes its appearance in those at the end of the 11th and the 12th chapters. Another point of minor importance may also be adduced in this connexion, i.e. the manuscripts have the following *śloka* at the end of the 12th chapter.

स्त्र्यभिलाषे यथा कामी करोत्यंगविचेष्टितम् ।
स्त्रीसमक्षं तथा कुर्यादयं शृंगारवत्क्रियाम् ॥

As Durga is shown to be a hermit, to ascribe these verses to him will be highly inappropriate.

Durga and the Pariśiṣṭa.

Both the published editions of Durga's commentary regard the commentary on the portions of the 13th chapter as an integral part of Durga's work. But the MS. Wilson 475,[1] dated 1387 A.D., and MS. Mill 142[1], dated 1839 A.D., do not contain the commentary on the 13th chapter. In both these manuscripts the commentary is completed at the end of the 12th chapter and the MS. Mill 142, expressly say that the work is finished.

॥ समाप्तो ग्रन्थः ॥

Moreover, the 13th chapter was not added to the *Nirukta* by Durga's time, as is proved by his remark in the introductory part of his commentary:

अयं च तस्या द्वादशाध्यायी भाष्यविस्तरः ।
तस्येदमादिवाक्यम् । समाम्नायः समाम्नातः ॥

'And this (the *Nirukta*) is its (the *Nighaṇṭu's*) amplified commentary consisting of twelve chapters whose first sentence is "a list has been handed down by tradition".' Hence the commentary on the 13th chapter was written at a later period and attributed to Durga by some disciple or follower of his.

Yāska's contributions to Etymology, Philology, and Semantics.

1. *Date of Yāska.*

History is the one weak point of Sanskrit literature, being practically non-existent. Not a single systematic chronological record has survived, and so complete is the lack of any data to guide us in this matter that the dates of even the most famous Indian authors like Pāṇini and Kālīdāsa are still subject to controversy. Yāska's date cannot therefore be determined with absolute certainty. One can arrive at a relative date

[1] This evidence is, however, inadequate. To make the case plausible, it must be corroborated by the internal evidence, i.e. the difference of style, treatment, &c. With this view I am now systematically examining and comparing the commentary on the twelfth with that of the preceding chapters. Later on I shall add the result of my examination.

only by bringing together the isolated pieces of information supplied by archaeological finds, literary references, and accidental mention of known historical or political events. This evidence, however, is not conclusive, and is differently interpreted by various oriental scholars. There is a great difference of opinion among them about the precise date of Yāska, but at the same time there is also the unanimity which sets down his lower limit as not later than 500 B. C.. As this limit has not been questioned so far (while his upper limit is carried as far as 700 B.C.), it may therefore be safely assumed that Yāska lived at least about a century earlier than Plato. Both Yāska and Plato sum up as it were the results of their predecessors in philological and etymological investigations in the *Nirukta* and the *Cratylus* respectively. Both stand pre-eminent with regard to their age, and have dominated the thought of succeeding generations in their respective countries. Yāska's work is important for the history of philology and etymology. And as the representative record of the researches of ancient Indians, it is of considerable interest for a comparative study of the Indian and Greek achievements in these two branches of knowledge in the earliest period of their history.

2. *Phonetic equipment of Yāska.*

Before we proceed to examine, in detail, the principles laid down by Yāska for etymology, or his speculations in philology, it will be worth while to inquire whether Yāska was a properly qualified person to undertake the task, i. e. whether he possessed any knowledge of sound-laws, or, in other words, whether he received any phonetic training, and of what sort? As has already been pointed out, historical and biographical records about ancient India do not exist, or at least, if they existed, have not survived. Nothing definite is, therefore, known about the life of Yāska, nor about the period in which he lived, nor about the educational system which then prevailed. In the absence of such records it is therefore extremely difficult to ascertain the worth of his qualifications, or the extent of, and his familiarity with, sound-laws. Yet some indirect information can be pieced together by collecting a few isolated data capable of throwing some light on the subject. In the first place, Yāska is acquainted with a vast amount of Sanskrit literature. The numerous exemplary quotations occurring in the *Nirukta* conclusively show that he knew the Ṛg-veda, the Sāma-veda, the Atharva-veda, the Yajur-veda, and their *pada-pāṭhas*, the *Taittirīya Saṁhitā*, the *Maitrāyaṇī Saṁhitā*, the *Kāṭhaka Saṁhitā*, the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*, the *Gopatha Brāhmaṇa*, the *Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa*, the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*, the *Prātiśākhyas*,

and some of the *Upaniṣads*. The full list of all the works known to him is given in the Appendix. This shows that Yāska was a man of comprehensive knowledge and vast reading. Secondly, he refers to and quotes the opinions of the various schools of thought which existed in his time, i.e. the school of etymologists, the school of grammarians, the school of ritualists, the school of legendists, the school of *Naidānas* (i.e. specialists, in primary causes). Further, he discusses and criticizes the views of many authorities—his predecessors and contemporaries. The full list of these is also given in the Appendix. The mention of eminent scholars and schools of thought presupposes specialization in their respective departments of knowledge which implies some uniform system of training and a sufficiently high order of education extending over a long period. Otherwise it is difficult to conceive how these various schools could have come into existence at all. Thus it can be assumed without much doubt that Yāska had received some kind of training in one, or more than one, of these schools. He discusses the doctrines of the schools other than his own, and thus seems to have acquired a general familiarity with them to be able to do so. Thirdly, he distinctly mentions the *prātiśākhyas*, i.e. phonetic treatises which record the researches made by ancient Indians in the physiological and the acoustic aspects of Phonetics. These treatises themselves presuppose the existence of the *padı-pāṭhas*, i.e. 'the word texts', which give every word of the *saṁhitā* in its isolated state, i.e. free from the euphonic combinations, and analyse compounds into their component elements. Gradually by the time of Yāska, a strong phonetic feeling had come into existence, as is evident from the scientific arrangement and classification of the Sanskrit alphabet. This shows that Yāska was furnished with some phonetic equipment, such as the state of the scholarship of the time permitted him to acquire. This view is supported by the fact that Yāska is familiar with and recognizes the following phonetic phenomena: (1) Syncope as in जग्मुः (they went) from the root गम् (to go); (2) Metathesis as in स्तोका 'a drop' from श्चुत् (to drop), रज्जुः (rope) from सृज् (to emit), and तर्कु 'knife' from कृत् (to cut), and so on; (3) Anaptyxis, as in आस्थत् from the root अस् (to throw), द्वारः (door) from the root वृ (to cover), भरूजाः from the root भ्रस्ज् (to fry), &c.; (4) haplology as in तृच = *tri* + *ṛca*, i.e. 'three stanzas'.[1] He is also acquainted with assimilation, and has noticed an example of prākṛtization in the Ṛg-veda while explaining कुटस्य by कृतस्य (N. v. 24). For the detailed account of his observations on phonetic phenomena see Chapter II, sections

[1] All these words are found in the *Nirukta*, ii. 1–2. I have cited examples furnished by Yāska himself.

1–2. From what has gone before, it may be concluded that Yāska was a man of extensive reading, that he had pursued a systematic course of study, and that he was furnished with some phonetic equipment. This conclusion is further supported by the fact that his explanations are pervaded with a rationalistic spirit and devoid of the mystifying or supernatural element, a characteristic of the ritualist and the *parivrājaka* school, cf. e.g. Yāska's explanation of *Vṛtra*. He is altogether free from fanaticism, bigotry, and intolerance when he meets Kautsa's adverse criticism of what he believes to be the revealed hymns, but gives rational answers to the various points of objection. He is actuated by a scientific spirit even when he is dealing with gods. Thus, for instance, he classifies gods into various groups, i.e. the terrestrial, the atmospheric, and the celestial according to the sphere of their activity, and assigns definite functions to each. Yāska's classification of gods has nothing corresponding to it in the mythologies of other nations. Further, his treatment of synonyms and homonyms is also scientific. At first he attributes a particular meaning to a particular word, and then supports his assertion by quoting a passage, generally from the Vedic literature, in which that word is used in that particular sense. Whether or not one agrees with him in attributing particular meanings to particular words, it cannot be denied that his method is scientific and, notwithstanding his remote antiquity, surprisingly modern. This scientific spirit, so evident in the *Nirukta*, could be developed by a scientific training only. In the absence of any definite information, the preceding statement will, I think, give some indication as to Yāska's qualifications to undertake the task which he set before himself.

3. *Importance of Etymology.*

Taking both the East and the West together, Yāska is the first writer on etymology. He is also the first to treat it as a science by itself. According to the orthodox Indian tradition, the *Nirukta* has, for a long time, been recognized as a treatise which deals specially with etymology. But the claim of Yāska is not based on this recognition. He has enunciated his doctrines in the *Nirukta*. His remarks on the importance of etymology may sound very commonplace to us, but probably appeared to have the same profoundness of wisdom when they were first uttered about 2,500 years ago, as President Wilson's fourteen points for the modern political world. His arguments for etymology are summarized as follows:

(1) Etymology is essential for the proper understanding of the Vedic texts.

(2) Etymology is the complement of grammar.[1]

(3) Etymology is necessary for the analysis of the *saṁhitā* into the *pada-pāṭha,* and of words into their component elements.

(4) Etymology has practical utility, for it enables one to discover the primary deity of a stanza which bears the characteristic marks of more than one deity, and thus helps to perform the sacrifice with perfection.

(5) Etymology is a science, and should be studied for its own sake, for knowledge is commended, and ignorance is condemned. (Chapter I, sec. 15–17.)

4. *Principles of Etymology.*

Yāska's fundamental notion about language is, that all words can be reduced to their primordial elements which he calls roots. With this idea he lays great emphasis on the point that as every word can be traced to an original root, one should never give up a word as underivable. His first general principle is, 'One should give the etymological explanation of words whose accent and grammatical form are regular, and are accompanied with a radical modification in the usual manner', i. e. in accordance with the laws of phonology. One would hardly question the derivation of पाचक from पच् 'to cook', or of पाठक from पठ् 'to read', or of बोध from बुध् 'to know', or of भेद from भिद् 'to break', and so on. It should be observed that Yāska recognized the importance of accent, and accords it a due place in his principle. It is obvious that the above-mentioned rule is limited in its scope, for only a comparatively small number of words can fulfil the conditions therein laid down. Yāska therefore strikes a note of warning and says that a disproportionate importance should not be attached to grammatical form, for the rules of grammar are not universal like laws of nature, and have many exceptions, adding that one has also to take into consideration phonetic phenomena such as syncope, metathesis, haplology, anaptyxis, assimilation, &c. His second principle is that in case the accent and grammatical form are not regular, and are not accompanied with a radical modification, one should always take his stand on the meaning of the word and endeavour to derive it from some similarity of form, or if there is no such similarity of form, even from the similarity of a single letter or syllable. Thus, according to Yāska, one should not be afraid to derive, *dois, dû, doive, dusse,* &c. from *devoir,* 'to owe', or *iṣṭi* (sacrifice) from the root *yaj* (to sacrifice), on account of the apparent dissimilarity of their form. Comparative philology furnishes the best examples to illustrate Yāska's remark that often there is hardly any resemblance between a word and its original source, i.e. its primitive

[1] *Tad idaṃ vidyā-sthānaṃ vyākaraṇasya kārtsnyam.* N. i. 15.

and derivative forms. Cf. IE. **penque*; Skt. *pañca*; Zend. *pañca*; Gk. πέντε; Lat. *quinque*; Lith. *penkè*; Goth. *fimf*; Germ. *fünf*; OE. *fif*; Eng. *five*. Again, French *larme* and English *tear* have only *r* in common, both being otherwise quite different from their original source **dakru*, which assumed an Anglo-Saxon form *tear*, and a primitive Lat. *dacru*. The Eng. *ewe* and Lat. *ovis* have nothing in common, and each has exclusively preserved some parts of their original **owis*. Eng. *four*, Germ. *vier*, have only *r* in common with Gk. τέτταρες. Eng. *quick* (orig. 'alive') has only *i* in common with Gk. βίος (life). Eng. *sit*, and Gk. *hed* (ἕδρα, 'seat') have nothing in common, and each has preserved one exclusive part of the original **sed*. Again, cf. IE. **ghans*; Skt. *haṁsa*; Gk. χήν; Lat. *anser* (for *hanser*); Germ. *Gans*; OE. *gôs*; Eng. *goose*.

But the application of this rule by an incompetent person gives rise to grotesque results; many such cases are supplied by the *Nirukta*, e.g. Śākaṭāyana's derivation of *Sat-ya*, the *ya* of which he formed from the causal of *i*, and *Sat* from *as*, 'to be'. Yāska foresaw the danger of the misuse of his principle. So after laying down his rule, he adds a note of warning. He urges that single words isolated from their context should not be thus derived, for without a knowledge of the context, it is often difficult to know the precise meaning of a word. He recommends that derivations should not be explained for a person not acquainted, or not well acquainted, with grammar, and not for one who has not studied etymology as a pupil. He says, 'One should indeed explain derivations for one's own pupil who has been in residence studying etymology or for one who is capable of understanding; for the intelligent and for the diligent.' N. ii. 3.

The third principle of etymology laid down by Yāska is that one should derive words in accordance with their meanings. 'If their meanings are the same, their etymologies should be the same, if the meanings are different, the etymologies should also be different.' (N. ii. 7.)

This principle is on the whole sound, for in every language there occurs the phenomenon that words of different origin often assume the same form. For instance:

Skt. *Akta* derived from the root *aj* means 'driven'.
„ „ „ „ „ *añj* „ 'besmeared'.
Aja „ „ „ „ *aj* „ 'driver'.
„ = *a-ja* „ „ „ „ *jan* „ 'not born'.
Aniṣṭa = *an-iṣṭa* from √*iṣ* means 'unwished'.
„ = *an-iṣṭa* „ √*yaj* „ 'not sacrificed'.
Anudāra = *an-udāra* means 'a niggardly man'.

Skt. *Anudāra* = *anu-dāra* means 'followed by a wife'.
„ = *a-pavana* „ 'without air'.
Apavana = *apa-vana* „ 'a grove'.
„ = *a-vasāna* „ 'not dressed'.
Avasāna = *ava-sāna* „ 'resting-place'.

English *Abode*. From *abide*, meaning 'delay' or 'dwelling-place'.
Abode. OE. *abeód-an*, connected with the primitive verb *beódan*, meaning 'prognostication'; cf. *fore-bode*.
Abound. OFr. *abunder, abonder, habonder*; Lat. *abundāre*, meaning 'to be plentiful'.
„ = *a-bound*, meaning 'to get limits to'.
Admiral. OFr. *amiral*, derived from the Arabic *amīr-al*, latinized in various ways and assimilated according to popular forms, meaning 'a naval officer'.
„ A by-form of *admirable*. OFr. *amirable*, Lat. *admīrābil-em*, meaning 'exciting admiration'.
Adust. Lat. *adūst-us*, Fr. *aduste*, meaning 'scorched'.
„ = *a-dust*, meaning 'in a dusty condition'.
Aught. OE. *áht*; OHG. *êht*; Goth. *aiht-s*, meaning 'possession'.
„ OE. *á, ó + whit*; OHG. *eowiht, iowiht*, &c.; ME. *ōht, ōght*, meaning 'anything whatever'.
Bay. OFr. *baie*; Lat. *bāca*, meaning 'a small fruit, a berry'.
„ Fr. *baie*; Lat. *baia*, meaning 'an indentation of sea into land, or of land into the sea'.
„ OFr. *baée*; Lat. type *badāta*, meaning 'the division of a barn'.
„ OFr. *bay*; It. *bada*; Lat. *badare*, 'to open the mouth', meaning 'barking or baying'.
„ Cf. ON. *bágr, bægja*, 'to push back', meaning 'an embankment or dam'.
„ Short form of *bay-antler*, meaning 'the second branch of a stag's horn'.
„ Fr. *bai*; Lat. *badius*, meaning 'a reddish-brown colour'.
Beak. Fr. *bec*; It. *becco*; Sp. *bico*; Late Lat. *beccus*, meaning 'a bird's bill'.
„ 'A justice of the peace'.
„ A variant of *beek*, 'to warm'.
Bear. OE. *bera*; OHG. *bero*; Mod. G. *bär*; cf. ON. *björn*; Lat. *ferus*, meaning 'an animal'.
„ OE. *bęre*; cf. Goth. *barizeins*, meaning 'barley'.
„ OE. and OHG. *ber-an*; ON. *ber-a*; Goth. *bair-an*; Lat. *fer*; Gk. φερ; Skt. *bhar*, meaning 'to carry'.

English *Dole* derived from French *deuil* means 'grief'.
„ related to Teut. *deal*; Ger. *Teil* means 'portion'.
Fame. Fr. *fame*; Lat. *fāma* (report); Gk. *φήμη*, meaning 'public report'.
„ Fr. *faim*; Lat. *fames*; cf. OFr. *afamer*, meaning 'want of food, hunger'.
„ Obsolete form of *foam*.
Fast. OE. *fæstan*; OHG. *fastēn*; ON. *fasta*; Goth. *fastan*, meaning 'to abstain from food'.
„ ME. *fest*; ON. *fest-r*, meaning 'a rope'.
„ Fr. *faste*; Lat. *fastus*, meaning 'arrogance'.
Fold. OE. *folde*; OLG. *folda*; ON. *fold*, related to **felþu*, 'field', meaning 'ground'.
„ OE. *fealdon*; OHG. *fuldan*; ON. *faldu*; Goth. *falþan*; OTeut. **falþan*; cf. Lith. *pleta*; Gk. *δί-παλτος*, meaning 'to arrange one thing over another'.
„ OE. *falœd*; Mod. LG. *falt*, meaning 'an enclosure for domestic animals'.
„ ME. *fald*; OHG. *falt*; ON. *fald-r*, meaning 'a bend or ply'.
Hound. OE. *hund*; OHG. *hunt* (d-); Goth. *hunds*; ON. *hundr*; Gk. *κύων*, *κυν*; Skt. *śvan*, meaning 'dog'.
„ ME. *hūn*; ON. *húnn*, meaning 'a projection'.
Seal. OE. *sĕol*; OHG. *selah*; ON. *sel-r*, meaning 'an animal'.
„ OFr. *seel*; It. *suggello*; Lat. *sigillum*, meaning 'a device'.
Sound. Derived from Fr. *son*; Lat. *sonus*, means 'noise'.
„ OE. *sund*, means 'strong'.
„ Fr. *sonder*; Lat. *subundare*, means 'testing depths'.

French *Air.* Gk. *ἀήρ*; Lat. *āer-em*; Sp. *aire*, meaning 'the gaseous substance which envelopes the earth'.
„ OFr. *aire*, meaning 'disposition'.
„ It. *aria*, meaning 'melody'.
Champs. Lat. *campus*; It. *campo*; Sp. *campo*, meaning 'field'.
„ OFr. *cant*, meaning 'side'.
Chère. Feminine of *cher*, 'dear'.
„ Gk. *χαρά*, 'face'.
Cousin, -e. Lat. *consobrinus*; It. *cugino, -a*; Sp. *sobrino, -a*; Ptg. *sobrinho, -a*, meaning 'a relative'.
„ Lat. *culicinus*, meaning 'an insect'.
Devant. Preposition meaning 'before'.
„ Pr. participle of *devoir*, 'to owe'.
Feu. Lat. *focus*; It. *fuoco*; Sp. *fuego*; Ptg. *fogo*; OFr. *fou*, meaning 'fire'.

French *Feu*. Derived by Estienne and Scheler from Lat. *fuit* > *feut* > *feu*; by Ménage from Lat. *felix* > *felicis* > *felce* > *feu*; by Littré from OFr. *fahu* > *feü*, connecting with Lat. *fatutus*, meaning 'dead'.

Fier. Lat. *fidare* for (*fidere*); It. *fidare*; Sp. and Ptg. *fiar*, meaning 'to put confidence'.

„ Lat. *ferus*; It. and Sp. *fiero*; Ptg. *fero*, meaning 'proud'.

Firme. Lat. *firmus*; ME. *ferme*, meaning 'firm'; cf. Skt. √*dhṛ*.

„ Med. Lat. *firma*, meaning, a farm'.

Franc. Lat. *francus*; It. *franco*; Sp. and Ptg. *franco*, meaning 'free'.

„ Meaning 'a French coin'.

Geste. Lat. *gestus*, meaning, 'gesture'.

„ Lat. *gesta*; It. *gesta*, meaning 'heroic deed, poetry'; cf. *chanson de geste*.

Louer derived from Lat. *locare* means 'to let'.

„ „ „ „ *laudare* means 'to praise'.

German *acht*. OHG. *ahto*; MHG. *ahte*; Goth. *ahtau*; OE. *eahta*, derived from an IE. root; cf. Skt. *aṣṭau*; Gk. *ὀκτώ*; Lat. *octo*; Lith. *asztůni*, meaning 'eight'.

„ OHG. *âhta*; MHG. *âhte*; OE. *óht*, meaning 'proscription'.

Ball. From *bellen*, meaning 'barking'.

„ MHG. *bal*, *balles*; cognate with OHG. *ballo*; MHG. *balle*; ME. *bal*, *balle*; OTeut. **ballôn*, **ballôn*; cf. Lat. *foll-is*, 'something inflated'; Fr. *balle*, meaning 'a ball to play with'.

„ Fr. *bal*; It. *ballo*; Fr. *baler* or *baller*; Lat. *ballare*; Gk. *βαλλίζω*, meaning 'a dance'.

Bauer. OHG. *bûr*; MHG. *bûr*; LG. *buur*; ON. *búr*; OE. *búr*, 'dwelling'; cf. *neighbour*; OE. *néah-gebúr* and *nach-bar*; E. *bower*; OTeut. **búro(m)*, from Teut. √*bŭ*; IE. √*bhu*; cf. Skt. *bhū* (*bhūmi*, 'earth'); Gk. *φύω*; Lat. *fui* (*futurus*); meaning 'bird-cage'.

„ OHG. *bûâri*; MHG. *bûwœre*; cf. *Erbauer*, *Ackerbauer*, from the √*bauen*, 'to cultivate'; Du. *bouwen*; MHG., MDu. *bûwen*; meaning 'a peasant'.

Bulle. MLG. *bulle*; MDu. *bulle*; Du. *bul*, *bol*; ON. *bole*, *boli*; ME. *bole* (*boole*); cf. ME. *bule*, *bulle* and E. *bull*, *bullock*; meaning 'a buffalo'.

„ MHG. *bulle*; OE. *bulle*; E. *bull*; Fr. *bulle*, derived from Lat. *bulla*, meaning 'a papal mandate'.

German *Geiseln*. Pl. of *geisel*, OHG. *gīsal*; MHG. *gīsel*; OE. *gísel*, meaning 'hostages'.

„ A form of *geiszeln*, MHG. *geiseln*, meaning 'to whip'.

Kehren. OHG. *kēran*; MHG. *kēren*, meaning 'to sweep'.

„ OHG. *kęrian*; MHG. *kęrn*, meaning 'to turn'.

Kiefer. OHG. *kienforha*; MHG. *kienboum* and the corresponding word to OHG. **kienforhe*; cf. *Kien* and *Föhre*, meaning 'Scotch fir, pine tree'.

„ MHG. *kiver*, *kivel*, *kivele*; OSaxon. *kâflos*; OE. *ceáfl*, meaning 'jaw'.

Kiel. OHG. *kiol*, *chiol*; MLG. *kêl*, *kîl*; MHG. *kiel*; OE. *céol*; OS. *kiol*, meaning 'keel'.

„ MHG. *kîl*; LG. *quiele*; E. *quill*, meaning 'a piece of reed or feather of a bird'.

Laden. OHG. *hladan*; MHG. *laden*; OS. *hladan*; OE. *hladan*; Goth. *(af)halþan*; E. *lade*, meaning 'to load'.

„ OHG. *ladōn*; MHG. *laden*; Goth. *laþon*; OE. *laðian*, meaning 'shop'.

Mandel. MLG. MDu. *mande*; OE. *mand*, *mǫnd*; E. *maund*, meaning 'to count by fifteen'.

„ OHG. *mandula*; MHG. *mandel*; OFr. *almande*, also *amande*, *amandre*; cf. Sp. *almendra*; It. *mandorla*, *mandola*, meaning 'almond'.

Mark. OHG. *marka*; MHG. *marke*; OS. *marka*; OE. *mearc*, meaning 'boundary'.

„ MHG. *mark*; MDu. *marc*; ON. *mǫrk*; OE. *marc*; Med. Lat. *marca*, *marcus*; Fr. *marc*; It. *marco*, *marca*, meaning 'a coin'.

„ OHG. *marg*, *marag*; MHG. *marc*, *marg*; OS. *marg*; OE. *mearz*, *mearh*; MDu. *march*, *marg*; Mod. Du. *merg*; OTeut. **mazgo*; cf. AV. *mazga*; Skt. *majjan*, meaning 'the soft fatty substance of bones'.

Reis. OHG. *hriis*; MHG. *rîs*; ON. *hrís*; MDu. Du. *rijs*; OF. *hrís*, meaning 'twigs or small branches'.

„ MHG. *rîs*; MLG. *riis*; ME. *rys*; OFr. *ris*; It. *riso*; Lat. **orizum*; Gk. *ὄρυζα*; cf. Skt. *vrīhi*, meaning 'rice'.

Hindi *kāma* derived from Skt. *kṛ* means 'work'.

„ „ „ „ *kam* „ 'love'.

Examples might bę multiplied. It is clear that such words can be satisfactorily derived only with reference to their meaning, for being derivable

from more than one original source, they are liable to be connected with the wrong root unless the derivation is based on the meaning. Yāska's rule is therefore sound. But in criticism of Yāska's rule, it may be remarked that words, having the same origin, come to acquire different meanings. For instance, Lat. *cup(cupido)*, 'to desire', and Skt. *kup*, 'to be angry', have the same common origin. Again, cf. IE. *klutós*; Skt. *śrutás*; Gk. κλυτός; Lat. *(in)clutus*; OE. *hlūd*; Eng. *loud*. Yāska did not know any other language besides Sanskrit, his horizon was therefore necessarily limited, yet his familiarity with the two phases of the Sanskrit language, i. e. the Vedic and the classical, which is historically the development of the former, and which in their relation to each other bear a close correspondence to that of the Ionic and the Attic tongues, placed him on a better working ground than those who were not fully conscious of such historical development. There is no passage in the *Cratylus*, for instance, showing that Plato realized that the Attic was historically the outgrowth of the Ionic language. On the contrary, the following passage indicates that he was not aware of any such development.

5. *Plato on Etymology.*

Soc. 'Yes, my dear friend; but then you know that the original names have been long ago buried and disguised by people sticking on and stripping off letters for the sake of euphony, and twisting and bedizening them in all sorts of ways. . . . And the additions are often such that at last no human being can possibly make out the original meaning of the word.'[1] Again, Plato does not recognize that etymology has any scientific or even systematic basis. He does not seem to realize that derivation of words should be governed by some general rules. In addition to the above, I quote the following passage in support of my statement:

Soc. . . . 'Now attend to me; and first, remember that we often put in and pull out letters in words and give names as we please and change the accents.'[2] Evidently he did not attach much importance to accent. The only principle, which can hardly be so called, is contained in the following passage:

Soc. . . . . 'And whether the syllables of the name are the same or not the same, makes no difference, providing the meaning is retained; nor does the addition or subtraction of a letter make any difference so long

[1] Jowett, *Dialogues of Plato* (3rd ed.), vol. i, p. 358.
[2] *Ibid.* p. 341.

as the essence of the thing remains in possession of the name and appears in it.'[1]

These three passages from the *Cratylus* indicate that Plato looked upon etymology as a compendium of individual conjecture which would justify Voltaire's famous satire that, 'Etymology is a science in which vowels count for nothing and consonants for very little', and Max Müller's well-known epigram that, 'a sound etymology has nothing to do with sound'. The fundamental difference between Yāska and Plato is that the former distinguished roots from affixes and suffixes, i.e. the radical from the formative element, and hence was able to formulate general principles for analysing words into their constituent parts; the latter did not realize this distinction and consequently made conjecture the basis of etymology. It may be remarked, however, that Sanskrit is generally acknowledged to be more perspicuous than Greek; it was easier therefore to see this distinction in Sanskrit than it was in Greek, and besides Yāska had the advantage of inheriting this knowledge from a long line of predecessors who had made this discovery at a very early period. But Yāska's greatness, even if every one of his etymological explanations is proved to be wrong—as many are manifestly so,—lies in the fact that he is the first to claim a scientific foundation, and also the first to formulate general principles for etymology.

6. *Philological speculations of Yāska.*

In two aphoristic rules, Yāska enunciates his view as to why articulate speech is given preference to other modes of expression, such as gestures, movements of hands and body, &c. He says, 'words are used to designate objects with regard to everyday affairs in the world, on account of their comprehensiveness and minuteness'.[2] Durga, the commentator of Yāska, explains the term 'comprehensiveness', with regard to the psychological process involved in the apprehension of meaning through the instrumentality of the spoken word. He says that there are two phases of consciousness in the human mind, i.e. (1) the manifest, and (2) the unmanifest. When a person desires to express the manifest consciousness, his effort results in the exhalation of breath which modified in the various speech-organs produces the word. The word again pervades the unmanifest consciousness of the hearer, makes it manifest, and thus the meaning is apprehended.[3] Using philological terminology, we may express the same thing by saying that there are permanent word-records in the sub-conscious strata of the human

[1] Jowett, *Dialogues of Plato* (3rd ed.), vol. i, p. 385.

[2] The *Nirukta*, i. 2.

[3] Durga on N. i. 2.

mind. These word-records are brought from the sub-conscious to the conscious state by articulated speech. It may be objected that whatever the psychological process may be, the most important use of the word is to express and convey the meaning to somebody else, and this purpose can equally be accomplished by other methods, such as gestures, movements of hands, face, and eyes. As if Yāska had anticipated this objection, he adds the term 'minuteness' in his aphorism. Durga has the following comment: The movements of hands and the winking of the eyes, &c., are also comprehensive, they will express the meaning and in this manner we will be saved the trouble of studying grammar and the bulky Vedic literature. True, gestures, &c., are comprehensive, but they are not minute, i. e. they involve greater effort in production and are always indefinite. Even discarding Durga's elaborate explanation of 'comprehensiveness', Yāska's aphorism can mean only that words are used in the everyday affairs of the world because they are capable of giving expression to every kind of meaning with their numerous shades of difference, and are produced with comparatively less exertion. There seems to be no doubt that at the time of writing the above-mentioned aphorism, Yāska had in his mind the alternative method of expression by means of gestures, &c. And his argument that words are preferred to gestures, on account of the economy of effort, has a strikingly modern note.

7. *Origin of Language.*

Yāska is a follower of the school of etymologists, whose fundamental doctrines is that all words are derived from original roots.[1] Gārgya and the followers of the school of grammarians do not agree with him.[2] There is also a short discussion about onomatopoeia.[3] Aupamanyava maintains that there is no such thing as onomatopoeia, but Yāska holds that there are some words which are formed by the mere imitation of sounds of nature, mostly the names of birds, such as crow, partridge, &c., but which can be derived otherwise also. It is surprising that in this connexion he does not mention the word cuckoo. Besides the names of birds, he thinks that the following words are similarly formed. *Kitava*[4], 'a gambler'; *dundubhi*[5], 'a drum'; *ciśca kṛṇoti*[6], 'it makes a *ciśca* sound'; *kṛka*[7], the *former* part of *kṛkavāku*, 'a cock'. According to Yāska, onomatopoeia does not play any important part in the foundation of language. He discards

[1] *Nirukta*, i. 12.
[2] *Loc. cit.*
[3] *Op. cit.* iii. 18.
[4] *Ibid.* v. 22
[5] *Ibid.* ix. 12.
[6] *Ibid.* ix. 14.
[7] *Ibid.* xii. 13.

E

therefore the so-called Bow-wow theory.[1] As Yāska reduces all words to primordial roots, he may therefore be regarded as an adherent of the root-theory.

This again affords a point of difference from the *Cratylus*, where Plato, in attempting to trace the origin of the sounds of the alphabet to the sounds of nature, considers onomatopoeia to be the most important factor in the formation of language. As an objection to his theory, it may be remarked that the objects with which men in primitive society are most familiar would be things like 'cave', 'pit', 'tree', &c., and the naming of these objects precludes all imitation of natural sounds. Words like 'digger', 'weaver', &c., would represent a higher stage of civilization.[2]

8. *Parts of Speech.*

Yāska says that there are four parts of speech: noun and verb, preposition and particle.[3] At first sight, it seems inexplicable that an ancient author like Yāska should mention preposition as a part of speech and should ignore adverbs which historically can be shown to have been evolved at an earlier stage of the linguistic development than the former. The difficulty, however, disappears when it is remembered that prepositions in Sanskrit are seldom used to express case relations, but mostly serve as adverbial prepositions. With Yāska's division of speech into four parts may be compared the remarks of Dionysius of Halicarnassus, who attributes a similar classification to Aristotle.

'Composition is . . . . a certain arrangement of the parts of speech. . . . These were reckoned as three only by Theodectes and Aristotle and the philosophers of those times, who regarded nouns, verbs, and connectives as the primary parts of speech. Their successors, particularly the leaders of the Stoic school, raised the number to four, separating the article from the connectives.'[4] According to Aristotle, 'Diction viewed as a whole is made up of the following parts: the letter (or the ultimate element), the syllable, the conjunction, the article, the noun, the verb, the case, and the speech.'[5]

9. *Aristotle's definition of Noun and Verb.*

Yāska defines the noun and the verb as follows: 'A verb has *becoming* as its fundamental notion, a noun has *being* as its fundamental notion. But where both (i.e. *becoming* and *being*) are dominated by *becoming* as in a verbal noun), a *becoming* arising from a former

[1] Max Muller, *Science of Language*, vol. i, pp. 407–17.

[2] See also Max Muller, *loc. cit.*

[3] *Nirukta*, i. 1.

[4] *Literary Composition*, ch. iii, Roberts's ed., p. 71.

[5] *Poetics*, 20. 1456 b, Bywater's ed., p. 57.

to a later state is denoted by a verb, as 'he goes', 'he cooks', &c.; while the embodiment of the whole process beginning with the original and ending with the final conception, which has assumed the character of *being*, is denoted by a noun, as 'going', 'cooking', &c.[1] Further, *becoming* has six modifications: (1) genesis, (2) existence, (3) alteration, (4) growth, (5) decay, and (6) destruction.[2] With these may be compared Aristotle's definitions of noun and verb. 'A noun or name is a composite significant sound not involving the idea of time, with parts which have no significance by themselves in it. . . . A verb is a composite significant sound involving the idea of time, with parts which have no significance by themselves in it. Whereas the word 'man' or 'white' does not imply when, 'walks' and 'has walked' involve in addition to the idea of walking that of time present or time past.'[3]

In his definition of a verb, Aristotle lays great emphasis on the idea of time, but ignores the idea of action involved in it; his definition is therefore incomplete and states the element of lesser importance only, for of the two ideas of action, and time, the former is of primary and the latter of secondary significance. Yāska has hit on the right word, i.e. *becoming* which expresses both, the notion of action and time as well. Aristotle's definition of a noun is a negative one. He explains what it does not involve, but not what it positively does involve. Yāska, on the other hand, gives a positive definition, setting forth *being* to be the fundamental notion of a noun. Further, he also defines a verbal noun, which is ignored by Aristotle.

Yāska explains prepositions as words which bring into prominence the subordinate meaning of nouns and verbs. He then subjoins a list of twenty prepositions assigning to each its appropriate meaning. Proceeding further, he divides particles into three groups, (1) comparatives, (2) conjunctives, and (3) expletives. He defines these terms, giving a list of the particles of each group, explaining their meanings and illustrating their uses by suitable quotations from Vedic literature. They are treated in detail in the first chapter of the *Nirukta* (sec. 3–9).

Yāska observes the dialectical differences in the spoken language of his time. Thus he points out certain characteristics of the speech of the Aryans and the Kāmbojas, the people of the East, and the people of the North.[4] He acknowledges the relation of the classical to the Vedic Sanskrit. Thus he remarks that their vocabulary is identical,[5] that their use of prepositions and particles with occasional exceptions is similar.[6]

[1] *Nirukta*, i. 1.
[2] *Op. cit.* i. 2.
[3] *Poetics*, 20. 1456 b. 10, Bywater's ed., p. 58.
[4] *Nirukta*, ii. 2.
[5] *Op. cit.* i. 16.
[6] *Op. cit.* i. 3–9.

He seems to be conscious of the historical connexion of the two languages when he says that the words of the one are derived from the roots of the other.[1] He knows that it is not nouns only, but also verbs, which have synonyms. 'So many verbs have the same meaning. So many are the synonym of a noun (lit. being).'[2] He explains homonym as a word which has more than one meaning.[3] He also notices certain idiomatic expressions, whose order is immutably fixed as 'Indra and Agni', 'father and son', but not 'Agni and Indra', 'son and father'.[4]

Semantics.

How names are given.

The epoch of Yāska was an age of remarkable literary activity. There seems to be a general striving after the search of truth in all the departments of human knowledge. On the philosophic side, it marks the beginning of the Upaniṣadic period which preached monotheism of an exalted type, and gave expression to some of the sublimest thoughts ever recorded in the history of mankind. On the religious side, it was the harbinger of the Buddha who was soon to carry out a campaign of vigorous protestantism against the then prevailing ritualistic practices. Even in the matter of style, it is the period of transition which ushered in the era of the aphorism (*sūtra*). As shown above, the age was busy with grammatical and philological speculations, nor was semantics ignored. In the first chapter of the *Nirukta* (see 12–14), Yāska discusses the question, how names are given. The most important arguments are set forth in the form of questions and answers. A critic is introduced who raises the various points of objection, each of which is duly answered by the author. It is a dialogue consisting of two monologues which are put in the mouths of the critic and the author in succession. The arguments are as follows: (1) Every being who performs a particular action should be called by the same name, e.g. every one who runs on the road should be called *aśva* (runner), and not the horse alone; everything that pricks, as a needle or spear for instance, should be called *tṛṇa* (pricker) and not a blade of grass alone. (2) Every being should be given as many names as the actions with which that particular being is associated, e.g. a pillar should be called not *sthūṇā* (i.e. which stands upright) only, but also *darā śayā* (i.e. which rests in a hole), and also *sañjanī* (i.e. which is joined with the beams). (3) Only such words should be used in giving names as are regularly derived from roots according to the rules of grammar, so that

[1] *Nirukta*, ii. 2. [2] *Op. cit.* i. 20. [3] *Op. cit.* iv. 1. [4] *Op. cit.* i. 16.

the meaning of the object which they denote, should be quite clear and free from doubt, e.g. *puruṣa* (man) should be *puri-śaya* (i.e. city-dweller); *aśva* (horse) = *aṣṭa* (i.e. runner); *tṛṇa* (grass) = *tardana* (pricker) and so on. (4) If the name of an object is to be determined by its actions, the being precedes the action (e.g. the horse comes into existence before it actually runs), the designation of a being, which is earlier, from an action, which is subsequent to it, is not tenable (perhaps for the reason that it will leave the being nameless during the interval). (5) People indulge in sophistry in explaining names, as for instance, when it is said that earth (*pṛthivī*) is so called on account of its being broad (*prath*), they do not consider as to who made it broad and on what basis.

Rejoinder.

(1) We find that of the beings who perform a particular action, all do not get the same name but only a few, e.g. every one who cuts wood is not called *takṣaka*, but the carpenter alone is so called; it is the ascetic only who is called *pari-vrājaka* (i.e. a wanderer) and not every one who wanders; it is only the sap of the sugar-cane that is called *jīvana* (i.e. enlivening) and not everything that enlivens; it is only the planet Mars that is called *bhūmi-ja* (i.e. earth-born), and not everything that is born from the earth and so on. He seems to imply that there is a law of specialization by which a particular name comes to be exclusively associated with a particular object.

(2) He means to say that in spite of their manifold activities, objects take their name from one particular action, which is the most important and the most special to them, e.g. a carpenter performs many actions, yet he is called *takṣaka* (i.e. a cutter of wood), because the shaping of things by cutting wood is his most important function and can be specially associated with him. Durga has the following comment on it:

त्वमपि पश्यसि वयमपि पश्याम . . . तचन् कश्चित्तचेत्युच्यते । अन्यस्तचन्नपि न तचेत्युच्यते । आह कोऽच हेतुरिति । शृणु लोकमेव पृच्छ तमेवोपालभस्व न मयैष नियमः कृत इति । अथ च तद्यथा समानमीहमानानां कश्चिदेवार्थेन संयुज्यते कश्चिन्न . . . । स्वभावतो हि शब्दानां क्रियावत्त्वेऽपि सति काश्चिदेव क्रियामङ्गीकृत्यावस्थिति र्भवतीति । अथवा क्रियातिशयकृतो नियमः स्यात् । यो हि यदतिशयेन करोति तस्या- नेकक्रियावत्त्वेऽपि सति तद्धेतुक एव नामधेयप्रतिलम्भो भवतीत्ययं समाधिः । अथवा न ब्रूमो यो यच यदा च तचति स एव तचेति । किं तर्हि यो यदा यच तथा भवति स एव तचेति . . . पश्यामोऽनेकक्रियायुक्तानामप्येकक्रियाकारितो नामधेयप्रतिलम्भो भवति

. . . तत्र यदुक्तमेकस्यानेकक्रियायोगादनेकनामता प्रसज्येतेति । एतदयुक्तम् । यदि चोक्तमनेकेषामेकनामतैकस्य चानेकनामता प्राप्नोति ततश्च व्यवहाराप्रसिद्धिरिति । नहि तदुभयमपि । अनेकेषामेकक्रियायोगेऽपि हि सत्येकस्य चानेकक्रियायोगेऽपि हि सति व्यवस्थित एव शब्दनियमः स्वभावत एव लोके ।

'Thou seest, my friend, and we also see, that one man who cuts wood is called 'carpenter', while another who does the same is not so called. You may well ask the reason. Listen; go and ask the world, quarrel with the world if you like, for it is not I who made this law. But this is what we find: of those who do the same work, some are named in accordance with that activity, others not. You may say that because one object is named in accordance with that activity, therefore others doing the same thing should be similarly named . . . Although all nouns are derived from verbs, the choice of names with reference to a particular action is made by nature (*svabhāvataḥ*); or it may be that the choice is made by the law of special action. A man who performs one particular action more specially, whatever other actions he may perform, will obtain his name from that particular action. This is a settled rule. For we do not call the man, who cuts wood now and then, by the name of carpenter, but him we call carpenter who cuts wood at any time, or in any place and always. This is an instance of a name, the choice of which is made by special action and this name may be freely given to others who perform the same action specially. And if sometimes, or somewhere, some other action is still more special to them, they will obtain their names in accordance with that action only. . . .

We see that persons who perform many actions, obtain their names from one particular action. A carpenter performs many other actions, but he is not called after those activities. . . . If it be said, that many persons who perform the same action, should have a common name, and one person who performs many actions, should have as many names, all that we can say is, that it is contrary to the practice of the world. *Neither is the case.* Whether many persons perform a particular action, or a single person many actions, the law about the names is that the choice is made by natural selection.'[1]

With this may be compared the remarks of Bréal.

'One conclusion is to be drawn from all that has gone before: it is an undoubted fact that Language designates things in an incomplete and

[1] Cf. Max Müller's translation of some parts of the above-quoted passage (*ibid.*, p. 167).

inaccurate manner. *Incomplete*: since we have not exhausted all that can be said of the sun when we have declared it to be shining, or of the horse when we say that it trots. *Inaccurate*: since we cannot say of the sun that it shines when it has set, or of the horse that it trots when it is at rest, or when wounded or dead.

Substantives are signs attached to things: they contain exactly that amount of truth which can be contained by a name, an amount which is of necessity small in proportion to the reality of the object. . . . It will be impossible for language to introduce into the word all the ideas which this entity or object awakens in the mind. Language is therefore compelled to choose.' [1]

(3) Many words whose grammatical form is quite regular are used to denote names of objects, such as *vratati* (creeper), *jāgarūka* (wakeful), *darvi-homī* (one who sacrifices with a ladle), &c.

(4) We find that many objects get names which are based on subsequent actions, e. g. the wood-pecker.

(5) If *pṛthivī* (earth) is derived from √*prath* (to be broad) there is no sophistry at all. It is not necessary to consider as to who made it broad and on what basis, for it is broad to the eye.

Thus the question is discussed in the *Nirukta*. The same question is discussed at length in the *Cratylus* also, wherein Plato propounds three theories and makes the three characters in the dialogue their exponents. Hermogenes holds that names are conventional, arbitrarily given, and altered at will. Its antithesis is represented by Cratylus who maintains that they are natural. Socrates takes an intermediate position and admits that names are natural and at the same time have an element of convention as well.[2]

i. Early anti-Vedic Scepticism.

In the fifteenth section of the first chapter of the *Nirukta*, a critic is introduced in the person of Kautsa, who not only questions the authority of the Vedas, but actually maintains that the Vedic stanzas are meaningless, adducing several arguments in support of his assertion. From the twentieth section of the same chapter it is evident that Yāska believes the Vedic hymns to be revealed, having been handed down from generation to generation by oral tradition, and requiring to be studied with great care; the purpose of his own work being to facilitate this study. As the

[1] *Semantics*, ch. xviii, Eng. trans. by Cust, pp. 171, 172.

[2] Cf. Jowett, *Dialogues of Plato* (3rd ed.), vol. i, pp. 327-8, 358, 366, 378.

Nirukta is one of the six auxiliary treatises of the Veda, it is rather difficult to say with what object Yāska presented and tried to controvert the view of his opponents, for it is inconceivable that the learned theologians would reproduce, in their orthodox books, a controversy which challenges the most fundamental beliefs of their religion. The reproduction of the Kautsa controversy indicates on the one hand, that not only Yāska was endowed with a rationalistic spirit, and was free from bigoted fanaticism, but also that it was possible to carry on such discussions with tolerance at that period of remote antiquity; and implies on the other, that Kautsa was an eminent scholar, or some great personality, or the exponent of some philosophic system, whose thought could not be ignored. Some, however, think that Yāska has invented Kautsa as a convenient method of giving expression to Vedic Scepticism. This view is conjectural, and is not supported by any evidence. Yāska uses the terms *eke*, and *ekam*, *aparam*, &c. when he wants to refer to something in general, and he could have very well employed the same terms with regard to the above-mentioned controversy, had it not been associated with a particular individual, i.e. Kautsa. There is no ground to doubt the historical existence of the authorities whose opinions are quoted, or referred to, or to whom particular statements are attributed, by Yāska. And unless the contrary can be proved, it may be assumed that Kautsa was an historical entity. It may also be taken for granted that he was the leader of a movement, which may be described as something akin to materialistic rationalism, and which was the result of a remarkable literary activity, a characteristic of the epoch of Yāska, as pointed out elsewhere. But Kautsa was by no means the originator of such a movement, the beginning of which can be traced to an earlier period. Its origin is probably to be sought in sectarianism. For a considerable time, the *Atharva-veda* was not recognized as divine revelation. For the followers of the *Atharva-veda*, it was therefore necessary to demonstrate the superiority of their own Veda to the RV., the SV., and the VS. Perhaps the most effective means, employed for the achievement of this object, was to invent legends and allegorical stories, in which all the four Vedas are introduced, and in which a certain task is proposed for them. The RV., the SV., and the VS. are invariably shown to be incompetent in its performance, and it is given up as too difficult by the three Vedas in succession, being finally accomplished by the AV., whose superiority over the other three Vedas is thus implicitly expressed. I quote the following two stories from the Gopatha Brāhmaṇa in support of my statement:

तान्वागभ्युवाच । अश्वः ग्रस्येतेति । तथेति । तमृग्वेद एत्योवाचाहमश्वं ग्रसेयमिति ।

तस्मा अविक्रान्ताय महद्भयं सस्रजे । स एतां प्राचीं दिशं भेजे । स होवाचाशान्तो न्वयमश्व इति । तं यजुर्वेद एत्योवाचाहमश्वं शमेयमिति । तस्मा अविक्रान्ताय महद्भयं सस्रजे । सा एतां प्रतीचीं दिशं भेजे । स होवाचाशान्तो न्वयमश्व इति । तं सामवेद एत्योवाचाहमश्वं शमेयमिति । केन नु त्वं शमिष्यसीति । रथन्तरं नाम मे सामाघोरं चाक्रूरं च तेनाश्वमभिष्टूयते । तस्मा अथ विक्रान्ताय तदेव महद्भयं सस्रजे । स एतामुदीचीं दिशं भेजे । स होवाचाशान्तो न्वयमश्व इति ।

'Speech said to them, "tame the horse". "Be it so", replied they. Having approached him, the RV. said, "I shall tame the horse". When he set about (accomplishing it), a great terror seized him. He turned her in the eastern direction. He declared, "this horse is wild indeed". The VS. approached him and said, "I shall tame the horse". When he set about (accomplishing it), a great terror seized him. He turned her in the western direction. He declared, "this horse is wild indeed". The SV. approached him and said, "I shall tame the horse". "How indeed wilt thou tame the horse?" "*Rathantaram* is the name of my song of praise which is neither terrific, nor harsh. With that the horse is praised". But when he set about (accomplishing it), the same great terror seized him. He turned her in the northern direction. He declared, "the horse is indeed still wild".'[1]

After these futile attempts, they are advised to seek *Ātharvana* the tamer. They approach him and request him to tame the horse. He prepares the water of tranquillity, which he sprinkles over the horse. From every limb of the horse flames fall down on the ground, and the horse, perfectly tame, salutes the sage.

The object of the following story is to show the incompetency of the three Vedas to afford protection:

ते देवा इन्द्रमब्रुवन् । इमन्नस्तावद्यज्ञं गोपाय . . . . स वै नस्तेन रूपेण गोपाय येन नो रूपेण भूयिष्ठं छादयसि येन शक्ष्यसि गोप्तुमिति । स ऋग्वेदो भूत्वा पुरस्तात्परीत्योपातिष्ठत् । तं देवा अब्रुवन् । अन्यत्तद्रूपं कुरुष्व नैतेन नो रूपेण भूयिष्ठं छादयसि नैतेन शक्ष्यसि गोप्तुमिति । स यजुर्वेदो भूत्वा पश्चात्परीत्योपातिष्ठत् । तं देवा अब्रुवन् । अन्यत्तद्रूपं कुरुष्व । नैतेन नो रूपेण भूयिष्ठं छादयसि नैतेन शक्ष्यसि गोप्तुमिति । स सामवेदो भूत्वा उत्तरतः परीत्योपातिष्ठत् । तं देवा अब्रुवन् । अन्यत्तद्रूपं कुरुष्व । नैतेन नो रूपेण भूयिष्ठं छादयसि नैतेन शक्ष्यसि गोप्तुमिति ।

'The gods said to Indra, "Do now protect this sacrifice of ours. Verily protect us with that form of thine, with which thou affordest us the greatest shelter, with which thou canst best protect us'. He assumed the

[1] GB. i. 2. 18; Bib. Ind. ed., p. 35.

form of the RV., and having approached, stood before them. The gods said to him, "assume some other form; with this form thou canst not afford us the greatest shelter, with this form thou canst not best protect us". He assumed the form of the VS., and having approached stood behind them. The gods said to him, "assume some other form; with this form thou canst not afford us the greatest shelter, with this form thou canst not best protect us". He assumed the form of the SV., and, having approached stood to their north. The gods said to him, "assume some other form; with this form thou canst not afford us the greatest shelter, with this form thou canst not best protect us".'[1]

Indra then assumes the form of the *Brahma-veda,* i.e. the *Atharva-veda,* which is approved by the gods as competent to give them the greatest protection.

It need hardly be said that the efforts of the followers of the *Atharva-veda* were crowned with success, for, in course of time, the AV. was recognized as one of the revealed scriptures. But their method of discrediting the other Vedas gave rise to a movement of inquiry and scepticism—a movement, the traces of which can still be discovered in isolated passages of the *Araṇyakas* and the *Upaniṣads.* Besides the fact that the anti-Vedic ideas have been preserved in the *Āraṇyakas* and the *Upaniṣads,* which, according to the orthodox tradition, are a part of the scriptures, indicates that the movement must have been important and wide-spread, so much so that even some of the Vedic Scholars came under its influence, and freely gave expression to their heterodox views, some of which have survived. I quote the following passages in support of the foregoing conclusion:

एतद्ध स्म वै तद्विद्वांस आहुर्ऋषयः कावषेयाः किमर्था वयमध्येष्यामहे किमर्था वयं यक्ष्यामहे । वाचि हि प्राणं जुहुमः प्राणे वा वाचं यो ह्येव प्रभवः स एवाप्ययः ।

'Verily it was so, then the Kāvaṣeyas, the learned seers, said, "to what purpose shall we study the Vedas, to what purpose shall we sacrifice? We sacrifice breath in speech, and speech in breath; whosoever is born is indeed the authoritative person."'[2]

उक्थमुक्थमिति वै प्रजा वदन्ति तदिदमेवोक्थमियमेव पृथिवीतो हीदं सर्वमुत्तिष्ठति यदिदं किंच ।

'People say, "Hymn, Hymn". This earth indeed, is the hymn, for all, whatever exists springs from it.'[3]

The study of the Vedas is regarded as *avidyā* (non-knowledge) in MU.

[1] GB. i. 2. 19; Bib. Ind. ed., p. 36.
[2] A. A. iii. 2. 6; Keith's ed., p. 139.
[3] A. A. ii. 1. 2; Keith's ed., p. 101.

I. 1. 4–5; as lower knowledge in MU. III. 2. 3; KU. I. 2. 23. The full force of this condemnation will be realized, if it is borne in mind that the *Upaniṣads* are also regarded as revealed books (*śruti*). The case would be analogous if, for instance, St. Paul had declared in one of his epistles that the study of the Bible is non-knowledge, or lower knowledge. The following are the other anti-Vedic passages: *Bṛh. U.*, I. 5. 23; *Kau. U.*, II. 5; *Ch. U.*, V. 11–24; *TU.*, II. 5; *Vivekacūḍāmaṇi* 2; the Jain *Uttarādhyāyana sūtras*, IV. 12; XIV. 12; *Gītā*, II, 42, 45; IX. 21: XI. 48, 53. In order to reconcile them with the pro-Vedic doctrines, the commentators have offered ingenious explanations of these passages.

It is possible that the Buddha came under the influence of this anti-Vedic movement at an early period, which may be responsible for his vehement denunciation not only of Vedic rites and practices, injunctions, and invocations, &c., but of Vedic lore. He held them up to ridicule, and discarded them as an obstacle to final emancipation. His views about Vedic knowledge have been preserved in the form of a dialogue in the *Tevijja sutta* in the *Dīgha Nikāya*. Two Brāhmaṇās, Vāsettha and Bhāradvāja quarrel as to which is the true path. Unable to settle their dispute, they go to the Buddha for a decision. The Buddha holds a conversation with them, and after perplexing and confounding them with analogies and arguments in a Socratic manner, gradually leads them to his own way of thinking, and finally converts them to Buddhism. The important parts of the dialogue with regard to the Vedas are the following:

13. 'Well then, Vāsettha, those ancient *Ṛṣis* of the Brāhmaṇās versed in the three Vedas, the authors of the verses . . . to wit, . . . Vāmadeva, Vessāmitta, Jamadaggi, Āṅgirasa, Bhāradvāja, Vāsettha, Kassapa, and Bhagu—did even they speak thus, saying: "We know it, we have seen it, where Brahmā is, whence Brahmā is, whither Brahmā is?"

"Not so, Gautama!"

15. . . . "Just, Vāsettha, as when a string of blind men are clinging to one another, neither can the foremost see, nor can the middle one see, nor can the hindmost see—just even so, methinks, Vāsettha, is the talk of the Brāhmaṇās versed in the three Vedas but blind talk . . . the talk . . . of the Brāhmaṇās versed in the three Vedas turns out to be ridiculous, mere words, a vain and empty thing."

24. "Again, Vāsettha, if this river Aciravati were full of water even to the brim, and overflowing, and a man with business on the other side, bound for the other side, should come up, and want to cross over, and he, standing on this bank, should invoke the farther bank, and say, 'Come hither, O Farther Bank! Come over to this side!'"

"Now what think you, Vāsettha? Would the farther bank of the

river Aciravati, by reason of that man's invoking and praying and hoping and praising, come over to this side?"

"Certainly not, Gautama!"

25. "In just the same way, Vāsettha, do the Brāhmaṇās versed in the three Vedas . . . say thus: 'Indra we call upon, Soma we call upon, Varuṇa we call upon, Īsāna we call upon, Pajāpati we call upon, Brahmā we call upon . . .' Verily, Vāsettha, . . that they, by reason of their invoking and praying and hoping and praising, should after death . . . become united with Brahmā—verily such a condition of things can in no wise be."

35. ". . . Therefore is it that the threefold wisdom of the Brāhmaṇās, wise in their three Vedas, is called a waterless desert, their threefold wisdom is called a pathless jungle, their threefold wisdom is called perdition."'[1]

In criticism of this, it may be remarked that the views of the Buddha concerning Vedic prayer are erroneous. His arguments, and especially his analogy of the bank of the Aciravati, are applicable to any other prayer as well, and thus prayer itself will become an absurdity. Not only is prayer a very important act of worship in every religion, but in the form of the wheel of prayer is the most distinguishing characteristic of Tibetan Buddhism. Moreover, prayer is a psychical phenomenon, it exerts a powerful influence on the mind through the medium of subconscious suggestion, and as such its efficacy is beyond doubt. Further, the analogy of the Buddha is fallacious. To compare not only sentient but omniscient and omnipotent God with an inanimate piece of matter like the bank of a river, and then to deduce a conclusion from this comparison that because the latter does not respond to prayer hence the former also does not do so, is altogether unjustifiable. Nevertheless the Buddha's denunciation of the Vedas developed a strong contempt for them in his followers who often trampled them under foot.[2] It is also probable that these teachings of the Buddha inspired other non-Vedic schools as well. The criticisms of some of these schools are equally vehement, and one seems to hear the reverberated echo of the voice of the Buddha even in some of their expressions. The following passage gives the views of the Cārvāka system:

इति चेत् तदपि न प्रमाणकोटिं प्रवेष्टुमीष्टे । अनृतव्याघातपुनरुक्तदोषैर्दूषिततया वैदिकम्मन्यैरेव धूर्तबकैः परस्परं कर्मकाण्डप्रामाण्यवादिभि ज्ञानकाण्डस्य ज्ञानकाण्डप्रामाण्यवादिभिः कर्मकाण्डस्य च प्रतिक्षिप्तत्वेन त्रय्या धूर्तप्रलापमात्रत्वेनाग्निहोत्रादेर्जीविकामात्रप्रयोजनत्वात् । तथा चाह भाणकः ।

[1] The *Dialogues of the Buddha*, translated into English by Rhys-Davids, *S.B.B.*, vol. ii, pp. 304–14: cf. also *S.B.E.*, vol. xi, pp. 159–203.

[2] See *Śaṅkaradigvijaya*, the episode of Kumārila Bhaṭṭa's life in a Buddhist monastery.

अग्निहोत्रं त्रयोवेदास्त्रिदण्डं भस्मगुण्ठनम् ।
बुद्धिपौरुषहीनानां जीविकेति बृहस्पतिः ॥
पशुश्चेन्निहतः स्वर्गं ज्योतिष्टोमे गमिष्यति ।
स्वपिता यजमानेन तत्र कस्मान्न हिंस्यते ॥

. . . .

त्रयो वेदस्य कर्तारो भण्डधूर्तनिशाचराः ।
जर्फरीतुर्फरीत्यादि पण्डितानां वचः स्मृतम् ॥

'If you object ... "how should men of experienced wisdom engage in the Agnihotra and other sacrifices", ... your objection cannot be accepted as any proof to the contrary, since the Agnihotra, &c. are only useful as means of livelihood, for the Veda is tainted by the three faults of untruth, self-contradiction, and tautology; then again the impostors who call themselves Vedic Paṇḍits are mutually destructive, as the authority of the Jñānakāṇḍa is overthrown by those who maintain that of the Karmakāṇḍa, and vice versā; and lastly, the three Vedas themselves are only the incoherent rhapsodies of knaves, and to this effect runs the popular saying: Bṛihaspati says that the (performance of) Agnihotra, the three Vedas, the three staves, and smearing oneself with ashes, are but means of livelihood for those who have neither sense, nor manliness.'[1]

'If a beast, slain in the *jyotiṣṭoma* sacrifice goes to heaven, why then, does not the sacrificer kill his own father?'[2]

'The three authors of the Veda were buffoons, knaves, and spirits of darkness. *Jarpharī, turpharī*, &c., these are the well-known rhapsodies of the Paṇḍits.'[3]

The *Ārhata* system has the following criticism with regard to the Vedas:

अनादेरागमस्यार्थो न च सर्वज्ञ आदिमान् ।
कृत्रिमेण त्वसत्येन स कथं प्रतिपाद्यते ॥

'And a non-eternal omniscient being cannot be the subject of an eternal Veda; then how can he be expounded by a spurious and a false Veda?'[4]

Cf. also: 'There was neither the Sāma-veda, nor the Yajur-veda, nor the Ṛg-veda, nor was any work done by man.'[5]

The earlier anti-Vedic scepticism, together with the doctrines of the Buddhist, the Cārvāka, and the Ārhata systems must have created, in

[1] *Sarva-darśana-saṃgrahaḥ*, Bib. Ind. ed., p. 3. For this passage I have adopted Cowell's translation with some modifications.

[2] *Op. cit.*, p. 6.

[3] *Loc. cit.*

[4] *Op. cit.*, p. 28.

[5] *Mahābhārata Vanaparvan*, 11284.

course of time, a considerable amount of opposition to the teachings of the Vedas. It was therefore necessary for the followers of the Vedas to answer the objections of their opponents and to re-establish their position. Hence Jaimini was compelled to devote almost the whole of the first *adhyāya* of the *Pūrva-Mīmāṁsā* to the examination and refutation of such objections. The substance of Kautsa's criticism, together with the subject-matter of Yāska's rejoinder is amplified with numerous additions in the first chapter of the PM. The controversy, however, is too long to be quoted here. Kumārila Bhaṭṭa, the commentator on the PM. was another expounder of Vedic doctrines, and after him the task devolved on the great Śaṅkarācārya, who by his eloquence, vast learning, profound philosophy, and great powers of debate rebuilt the shattered supremacy of the Vedic religion, and extirpated Buddhism[1] and other non-Vedic systems from the land of their birth. But adverse critics of the Veda, even after the great Śaṅkarācārya, have not been altogether unknown in India. For instance, Nānaka, the founder of the Ṣikh religion, may be mentioned as a notable teacher who laid great emphasis on saintliness, and discarded the Vedas as mere mythical records. He said:

Santa kī mahimā veda na jāṇe
Cāron veda kahāni.

'The greatness of a saint is not known to the Veda; all the four Vedas are merely (books of) stories.'

Hence we find that Sāyaṇācārya again reverts to the same discussion in the introduction of his commentary on the Ṛg-veda. The number of arguments for and against is still further increased. A brief summary of the controversy is subjoined:

Criticism.

'The *primâ facie* view is that there is no such thing as the Veda; how can there be a part of it, as the Ṛg-veda? .... It is not possible to admit the existence of the Veda, for it is not capable of definition or proof.'[2]

(1) If the Veda is defined as being the last of three kinds of proofs, perception, inference, and evidence, the definition will be too wide, for it will include the Smṛtis as well.

(2) If the Veda is defined as an instrument of apprehending transcendental things, the definition will again suffer from the same defect.

[1] However, the final blow was dealt by the Mohammedan invaders, who destroyed the Buddhist monasteries in the Northern part of India.

[2] See Max Müller's edition[2] of the RV. with the commentary of Sāyaṇācārya, vol. i, pp. 2-3. The Sanskrit text of the introductory part of Sāyaṇa's commentary, together with an English translation, is given by Peterson in his *Handbook to the Study of the Ṛgveda*, Part I.

(3) The qualifying expression, 'being not the product of human authors', will not improve the definition, for the Vedas are the works of human authors, though they may be super-men.

(4) If you say that by 'human authors' you mean 'men having a corporeal frame', we will draw your attention to the *puruṣa-sūkta*.

(5) If you say that by 'corporeal frame' you mean 'a body which is the result of the actions of a previous life', we will point out that Agni, Vāyu, and Āditya, the authors of the Vedas, were endowed with bodies which were the result of actions of a previous life.

(6) If the Veda is defined as a collection of words (*śabda-rāśiḥ*) consisting of the *mantra* and the *Brāhmaṇa*, it does not hold good, for up till now it has not been settled what is *mantra*, and what is *Brāhmaṇa*.

(7) Nor is there any proof of the existence of the Veda. The scriptural quotations in support of your contention are useless, as they are cited from the Vedas themselves, and nothing can be proved by its own evidence. No man, however clever, can mount his own shoulders.

(8) If you say that the consensus of public opinion is in favour of the Vedas, we will reply that the whole world can be deluded; for instance, the people believe in a blue sky, yet there is no such thing as sky, nor has its blue colour any reality.

Sāyaṇa's rejoinder.

(1) The definition of the Veda as a collection of words, consisting of the *mantra* and the *Brāhmaṇa* is faultless; therefore Āpastamba has said, 'The Veda is the name given to the *mantra* and the *Brāhmaṇa*.'

(2) It is true that things like a jar, or a piece of cloth, &c., are not self-luminous, but it does not follow from this that the sun, and the stars, &c., too have no such character. Granting that it is impossible for a man to mount his own shoulders, nevertheless, the Vedas have the power to illuminate themselves as well as other things.

(3) You have to recognize the various kinds of proofs, including evidence. And the evidence of the Smṛtis, and of tradition cannot but be admitted as proof of the existence of the Veda. Hence, the Vedas cannot be overthrown by any of the infidels like the followers of Cārvāka.

Further criticism.

(1) Admitting that there exists a thing called the Veda, it is not worth a commentary, for the Veda is of no authority (*na hi Vedaḥ pramāṇam*).

(2) Some define authority as 'an instrument of sound experience', others as 'a means of acquiring knowledge, not known before'. Neither of these is to be found in the Veda.

Then follows an amplified statement of Kautsa's criticism. Sāyaṇa's reply gives the substance of Yāska's rejoinder with additions and modifications, to which is added a long quotation from the first chapter of the *pūrva-Mīmāṃsā,* reference to which has already been made.

It would be superfluous to collect the pro-Vedic passages. The Vedas are the foundation of the whole of Sanskrit literature. But the triumph of the Vedic school is apparent from this fact alone that all the anti-Vedic systems have either perished, or been driven into exile, or been reduced to insignificance. Thus the pre-Buddhistic anti-Vedic scepticism can now be traced in a few isolated passages only. Buddhism, once the state religion of the Mauryan Empire at its zenith under Aśoka,—the then greatest Empire in the world—has been banished from its native land. The Cārvāka and the Ārhata systems have been reduced to insignificance. Their followers are few and far between, and their influence on Indian thought and religion is so small that for all practical purposes it can be safely ignored.